THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 7—12 OCTOBER—DECEMBER Vol. XXXVI

To our Readers.

As the first edition of the *Modern Churchman* Conference Number for 1946 proved unequal to the demand, a second issue has since been published.

The January 15 issue of the *Modern Churchman* completes Volume XXXVI.

The first number of Volume XXXVII will be published on April 15, 1947.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Primate's Reunion Proposals

The Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon preached on Sunday, November 3, before the University of Cambridge, on 'A new approach to Reunion,' has attracted much attention at a time when most Christian people in this country have given up all hope of Christian Reunion.

Modern Churchmen have for many years past pleaded that our Church authorities should proceed towards Reunion, not by way of securing mutual denominational agreement on a number of ecclesiastical constitutional and dogmatic issues—where hitherto they have differed—but by the practice of Christian fellowship, especially by proclaiming to all communicants of non-Anglican Christian denominations that they are heartily welcome to communicate at the altars of the Church of England. All Liberal Churchmen certainly, and, we believe, all Evangelical Churchmen, support such a Reunion policy. We have to confess, however, that our Anglo-Catholic fellow-Churchmen—with few exceptions—are opposed to it, and it is this Anglo-Catholic objection which has, up till now, halted all advance in this country towards Christian intercommunion.

When we first read the brief press announcements of the Primate's Cambridge proposal for Reunion we had hoped that this primary and fundamental step to Christian Reunion, by means of

inter-communion, was what at long last an Archbishop of Canterbury had advocated. Closer examination has indicated that we were misled; the Primate's proposal is vastly more complicated than we had anticipated. As a result our ardent hopes for the success of the Primate's scheme have suffered a depressing reaction. We cite the following pertinent passages from the Primate's sermon as selected and collected in the *Church Times* of November 8:

> In every main Christian denomination are found in abundance those who have entered by the one door, have found the one Saviour, and draw from Him their life. Of all such Christ is the Shepherd, and all such belong to His flock; but they are in different folds, fenced off from one another by barriers—some trivial enough, some reaching up (as it would seem) to heaven itself—which the long course of the Church's history has erected. So while in each fold the followers of our Lord draw their life from Him, that divine life does not freely circulate between the folds in the life-giving operations of worship to Him who is the Head of the Church, and of sacramental fellowship between His members.
>
> It has been the great achievement of the past two generations to focus attention upon that which all denominations hold in common and receive from Christ, their one Shepherd. Rome alone remains officially unwilling to acknowledge other folds under the one Shepherd, or even to join in prayer with them. Between the others there is an interchange of fellowship and prayer and thought, and a searching to overthrow the barriers between them. On the theology of Redemption and Grace, in the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments, even on the Church itself there are no barriers that reach up to heaven. It is round the theology of the Ministry that the tensions most exist.
>
> BARRIERS OF HABIT
>
> But there are all sorts of other barriers, not of theology but of habit. Each denomination has its own idiom of worship within the framework of the Christian verities, its own idiom of thought and speech, of procedure and government, of family life. And the inertia in the minds of many people of many denominations as regards steps to unity is due less to theological reasons than to dislike of a merging of domestic habits.
>
> Schemes of reunion have generally been what I will call constitutional. They posit, between two or more denominations, an agreed constitution by acceptance of which they become one. Its articles must contain all that each negotiating party specially values and omit anything which it stubbornly resists; they must be non-committal where there is unresolved difference of opinion: they must set out an organization and a method of government: with this new constitution in their hands the negotiating denominations are to lose their formerly separate identities.
>
> I think that reluctance is caused, partly by fear of loss of that identity which is a precious thing to those concerned, partly by fear of compromises the full implications of which cannot be foreseen, partly by fear of unfamiliar forms of government, and all the time by fear of a written constitution. A constitution is an artificial thing, and may imperil the life it seeks to promote.

In this country, I think, there are three special reasons which make the constitutional method the most difficult of all ways to reunion. In the first place, the Church of England is an established Church; it has a very complicated legal nexus with the State, which enters deeply into its machinery of government. The Free Churches would certainly not accept the establishment as it is.

Secondly, it is one thing for four dioceses in India to go out of the Anglican Communion, into a province with a constitution of its own and a position within the Catholic Church still to win. But for the Church of England to go out of the Anglican Communion would disrupt that Communion itself, by depriving it of its nodal point.

And thirdly, there are tensions within the Church of England itself which are not resolved: it has its own problem of recovering its own spiritual authority over itself and of re-ordering its own life. We need to have, as I believe we are getting, a surer hold upon our own tradition before it can be offered to or accepted by others as their own.

Is there any other means by which we can get towards that free circulation of the life of Christ between the folds of his flock? We do not desire a federation: that does not restore the circulation. As I have suggested, the road is not yet open, we are not yet ready, for organic or constitutional union. But there can be a process, short or long, of assimilation, of growing alike. What we need is that, while the folds remain distinct, there should be movement towards a free and unfettered exchange of life in worship and sacrament between them.

The Church of England is in full communion with the Old Catholics on the Continent, and its relations with the Orthodox Churches on the one hand, and with the Churches of Sweden and of Finland on the other, already approach, if they do not yet reach, full communion.

Basis for Full Communion

My longing is not yet that we should be *united* with other Churches in this country, but that we should grow to *full communion* with them. Full communion between Churches means not that they are identical in all ways, but that there is no barrier to exchange of their ministers and ministries.

The non-episcopal Churches have accepted the principle that episcopacy must exist along with the other elements in a reunited Church. For reasons obvious enough in Church history, they fear what may be made of episcopacy. But they accept the fact of it. If they do so for a reunited Church, why not also and earlier for the process of assimilation, as a step towards full communion? It may be said that in a reunited Church they could guard themselves in the constitution against abuses of episcopacy. But they could do so far more effectively by taking it into their own system. If non-episcopal Churches agree that it must come into the picture, could they not take it and try it out on their own ground first?

It is not, of course, quite as simple as all that. There are requirements and functions which Catholic tradition attaches to the office of a bishop in the Church of God, which, if our aim is assimilation and full communion, must be safeguarded. Negotiators in the past have been able to agree upon them, and could with hope inquire into them further, if our non-episcopal brethren were able to contemplate the step I suggest. As it seems to me, it is an easier step for them to contemplate than those involved in a union of Churches; and if achieved, it would immensely carry us forward towards full communion, without the fearful complexities and upheavals of a premature constitutional union.

AGREEMENT IN FAITH

In putting forward this suggestion, I am presupposing that between the Churches which concerned themselves with it there would be found to be agreement upon the essential principles of the Church, of the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and of the Ministry itself, as 'a gift of God through Christ to His Church, essential to its being and well-being, perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit' (Lausanne, Report 5). Differences of interpretation are not such as to forbid communion, and indeed are to be found with each body.

If, then, non-episcopal Churches could take episcopacy into their systems, I should hope that in preparation for it, along the lines of recent Canadian proposals, each communion, episcopal and non-episcopal, should contribute the whole of its separate ministry to so many of the ministers of the other as were willing to receive it. By that means there would be assimilation at work from the start, at the presbyteral level as well as at the episcopal level.

It is because I fear a stalemate that I venture to put this suggestion forward for examination. Cannot we grow to full communion with each other before we start to write a constitution? If there were agreement on the whole venture, I would thankfully receive at the hands of others their commission in their accustomed form, and in the same way confer our own: that is the mutual exchange of love and enrichment to which Lambeth, 1920, called us.

A careful study of these pertinent passages has cast us again into the Slough of Despond. We had thought that the Primate's plan for Reunion was to begin by by-passing all the constitutional differences between the Church of England and other Christian denominations. We had even dared to hope that it was also going to by-pass all the dogmatic differences between the Church of England and other Christian denominations and that the simple willingness to unite together at the Lord's Table, in whatever ecclesiastical edifice that Table happened to be situated, was to be the great initial step towards Christian Reunion. In short: that the Primate's first step towards Christian Reunion was to be by Christian inter-communion — the Christian will to become one by uniting together at the Lord's Table. Alas! we were too hopeful and too simple. It seems to be clear that, as you cannot have Reunion with the Church of Rome unless you accept the Papal authority, so you cannot have Reunion with the Church of England unless you are prepared to accept episcopal government in some form or other. The Church of England seems unable to-day to go back behind St. Ignatius, but until the Church in its Reunion policy is prepared to do this, and go back to Jesus Christ, we shall not secure Christian Reunion. The one flock of which He is the one Shepherd does not need as essentials of its unity either ecclesiastical constitutions or ecclesiastical dogmas. If we are to have Christian Reunion the re-united Church of the future will have to be satisfied to acknowledge as Christian brothers all who worship

the Divine Father, acknowledge the Lordship of the Divine Saviour, seek the guidance and strength of the Divine Spirit and make the supreme aim of their life the advancement of the Kingdom of God on earth. Not until Christians agree to accept this primal form of the Christian religion as essential Christianity, and to base their Christian fellowship on it alone, will Christian Reunion be secured. Richard Baxter saw the need for this three centuries ago. He wrote :

> 'The plague of the Church for above a thousand years has been the enlarging of our Creed and making more fundamentals than God ever made.'

We are grateful to the Primate for his resolution to advance the Reunion of Christendom. His ideal of Reunion based on inclusion not exclusion, on practical co-operation not merely theoretical agreement, is all to the good. But this ideal must definitely include the simplification of essential Christian Faith and Practice.

In essentiis unitas
In non-essentiis libertas
In omnibus caritas.

Repercussions of the Modern Churchmen's Conference, 1946

The spirit of the Modern Churchmen's Conference of 1946 at Westfield College, London, was, in the judgment of its members, one of delightful Christian fellowship. In the city of Coventry, the plans of whose new cathedral are intended both to symbolize and realize the spirit of Christian fellowship, the effect of the Modern Churchmen's Conference has been far otherwise.

In discussion at the Conference the Rev. Frank Moyle, Rector of Allesley, Coventry, referred to the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ as a myth. This utterance was widely reported in the London Press and came under the notice of the clergy of the city of Coventry. As a result, seventeen clerics of the city of Coventry published the following letter in the *Coventry Evening Telegraph* :

> We, the undersigned Clergy of this City, responsible for the cure of souls under the Lord Bishop, desire to make the following reply to the Rector of Allesey's attack upon the truth of the Virgin Birth of our Lord.
>
> We believe and teach the doctrine because it is part of the universal affirmation of the Christian faith through the centuries, because it is supported by the clear witness of the New Testament, and because it is affirmed by the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.
>
> In view of our Lord's unique character, His teaching and miracles, and His resurrection from the dead, we see nothing surprising in the fact that His birth should also have been unique. On theological grounds we are aware that by this means alone His manhood could be safeguarded

from the taint of sin, and that the doctrine is therefore as much an affirmation of His true manhood as it is of His divinity.

When we are invited by Mr. Moyle to discard an article of religion like that of the Virgin Birth, we must reply that we, like the Rector, publicly consented to the Articles of Religion and to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, both at our ordination and at our institution and induction into our benefices. We are at a loss to understand, therefore, how such a denial could be made compatible with our faith or our honour.

After the publication of this letter the Bishop of Coventry most happily intervened with an enlightened and authoritative statement:

A good many people have written to me, as Bishop, with troubled minds, asking what is the truth, as held by the Church of England, on certain doctrines, and what positions it is permissible to hold.

With them I join in the search for the truth in the Christian Faith—all my life. As Bishop I am under authority, and I refer them to the authoritative modern statement of Anglican Doctrine. It is the 'Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine' appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, published by the S.P.C.K. in 1938, from which I quote:

'The Affirmations of Faith, (*a*) The Virgin Birth. Page 81': 'The Church's tradition of faith in the Virgin Birth must not be taken in isolation from the totality of Christian beliefs about the Person and work of Christ. Indeed it is only in connection with their whole faith about Christ that the Virgin Birth possesses its traditional importance for Christians. At the same time, belief in it as an historical fact cannot be independent of the historical evidence, although in this case the subject is one on which the historical evidence by itself cannot be other than inconclusive.

Christian Conviction

'The main grounds on which the doctrine is valued are the following. It is a safeguard of the Christian conviction that in the birth of Jesus we have, not simply the birth of a new individual of the human species, but the advent of One who "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven." It is congruous with the belief that in the Person of Christ humanity made a fresh beginning. It coheres with the supernatural element in the life of Christ, indicating a unique inauguration of that unique life. It gives expression to the idea of the response of the human race to God's purpose through the obedience and faith of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

'Many of us hold, accordingly, that belief in the Word made flesh is integrally bound up with belief in the Virgin Birth, and that this will increasingly be recognised.

'There are, however, some among us who hold that a full belief in the historical Incarnation is more consistent with the supposition that our Lord's birth took place under the normal conditions of human generation. In their minds the notion of a Virgin Birth tends to mar the completeness of the belief that in the Incarnation God revealed Himself at every point in and through human nature.

'We are agreed in recognising that belief in our Lord's birth from a Virgin has been in the history of the Church intimately associated with its faith in the Incarnation of the Son of God. Further, we recognize

that the work of scholars upon the New Testament has created a new setting of which theologians in their treatment of this article are obliged to take account. We also recognize that both the views outlined above are held by members of the Church, as of the Commission, who fully accept the reality of our Lord's Incarnation, which is the central truth of the Christian faith.'

SCRIPTURE

'Scripture. Its Authority. The Bible as a whole. Page 31.'

'The Bible possesses authority for Christians on the ground that it is the classical literature of that progressive self-revelation of God in history which culminated in Jesus Christ.

'The Bible has been and is for the Christian Church the primary criterion of its teaching and the chief source of guidance for its religious life.

It further vindicates its authority by continuing to mediate to individuals the revelation which it records and by nurturing their spiritual life.

'The fact that the Church has accepted this particular body of literature as canonical Scripture invests it as a whole with an authoritative character for all its members.

'Nevertheless, the use made of the Bible as an authoritative source of teaching should be controlled by the following considerations:

'(1) The authority ascribed to the Bible must not be interpreted as prejudging the conclusions of historical, critical, and scientific investigation in any field, not excluding that of the Biblical documents themselves.

'(2) Christian thinkers are not necessarily bound to the thought-forms employed by the Biblical writers.

'(3) The Biblical writings display a wide variety of literary type. In using the Biblical books as a standard of authoritative teaching these facts must be taken into account. The supreme spiritual value of some parts of the Bible is not shared by all.

'(4) In estimating the relative spiritual value of different portions of the Bible, the standard is the Mind of Christ as unfolded in the experience of the Church and appropriated by the individual Christian through His Spirit. That is to say, the stages of the Biblical revelation are to be judged in relation to its historical climax.'

I hope the authoritative quotations I give will persuade many to read this report published by the S.P.C.K.

As Bishop I want to say just for the ordinary person—myself as one—there is no question that in the Church of England there continues unchallengeable and undisputed faith among us all that our Lord is the Divine Son of God.

I would remind Christian people, in moments of controversy, that charity is the condition of clarity when we are dealing with the truth about God or about each other.

The Bishop is indeed to be congratulated on the way in which he has faced and handled a very difficult situation. It seems to us that no wiser course could have been chosen than to refer the seventeen protesting clergy and all others interested in the dispute to the *Doctrinal Report* and its relevant statements. A crushing rejoinder from English Church History, Philosophical Theology

and Biblical criticism might be made to the statements and charges of the seventeen signatories, but we have not the space for this here and now. We can, however, direct attention to the three following points:

1. The sense in which subscription is made to the Prayer Book and Articles is determined by the form of subscription used. The old form of subscription was altered by Act of Parliament in the 'sixties of last century. By this alteration clerical subscription from being particular was made general. The clergy no longer assented and consented to every doctrinal statement in the Prayer Book and Articles. Henceforth they merely assented to the doctrine, *i.e.* the general teaching, of the Prayer Book formularies. A careful statement of all that this welcome change implied and was intended to effect in liberating the clerical conscience can be studied in Dean Stanley's *Essays in Church and State.*

2. That the Faith in the Incarnation does not demand acceptance of the Virgin Birth as historical fact was stated by that great scholar Dean Armitage Robinson in a public letter to Archbishop Davidson in 1903. This statement was accepted by the Primate without demur or criticism and is published by the Dean in the Preface of his book, *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation.* We cite from it the following relevant statement:

> 'If the Bishops were asked to declare that the Incarnation is a cardinal doctrine of the faith, such a statement would be superfluous indeed, but it would be true. But to say that the historical fact of the Virgin-birth is a cardinal doctrine of the faith is to use language which no Synod of Bishops, so far as I am aware, has ever ventured to use' (p. xiii).

3. Canon Peter Green, a stalwart orthodox traditionalist, respected as much by those who differ from him as by those who agree with him, in a recent contribution to the *Manchester Guardian* dealing with the views of that great Liberal theologian, Dean Hastings Rashdall, brings out clearly and strongly two Christian ways of interpreting the Incarnation, both of which go back to the New Testament:

> 'Alongside the main stream of Catholic belief, which we may call the incarnational doctrine, there had been from the first and all down the ages another stream, the emanational doctrine. To put the matter crudely we may say that the incarnationalist allows a likeness between God and man, but no community of nature, so that to him Christ is the lowest that God ever came in His search for fallen man. The emanationist holds that there is in every man a 'spark' or 'seed' (both words are technical terms) of the divine which smoulders in ordinary men, glows in the saints, and flamed in fullest splendour in Christ, so that He
> 'Rashdall saw this in the preface to the Fourth Gospel, "The Light which, coming into the world, lighteneth every man."'

As many of the clergy do not seem to be aware of this dual interpretation of the Incarnation, we have ventured to call attention to it. These three considerations support the Bishop of Coventry's judicious attitude in Mr. Moyle's case and justify the right of Mr. Moyle to use the Christian freedom of speech which he claimed. If the Christian Church to-day is going to identify the Incarnation with the Virgin Birth, then it ought to realize that by so doing it is rendering the Incarnation incredible for multitudes of modern-minded Christian men and women.

It was gratifying to learn that Mr. Moyle was invited by the B.B.C. to broadcast on Christmas morning in their overseas programme. We hope, when the ecclesiastical situation in Great Britain permits, we shall hear him broadcasting in the Home Service on Christmas Day.

The Archbishop of York on Mixed Marriages

Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York, in his Presidential Address to the Full Synod of the Convocation of York on October 16, 1946, dealt with the position in which the non-Roman Catholic partner of a mixed marriage is placed by the marriage regulations of the Roman Church in respect of the religion of the children of such a marriage.

It is most important that English Church people should be made fully aware of the true situation. The public generally is largely ignorant that in the case of mixed marriages the attitude of the Roman Church in this country has been changed in recent years by the enforcement of the *Ne Temere* Decree. Before the enforcement of this Decree in Great Britain large freedom was permissible to the parties in the mixed marriage with regard to the religious education of their children. For instance, by mutual agreement of the parents, the boys might be brought up in the religion of their father and girls in the religion of their mother: this actually occurred in a Duke of Norfolk's family. To-day, under the *Ne Temere* Decree, this freedom no longer exists. By that Decree all the children of a mixed marriage must be brought up Roman Catholics, and the non-Roman Catholic partner of the marriage must not only agree to this but must also undertake not to hinder it in any way. The public generally are not only unaware of this condition now imposed by the Roman Catholic Church in the case of mixed marriages, but not infrequently, we believe, those actually entering into such marriages are ignorant of the precise religious conditions imposed. This is due to a document being signed by both contracting parties to which is conjoined a very

important statement in the Latin tongue the actual contents of which are in all probability unknown to the non-Roman Catholic partner of the marriage.

Dr. Garbett's statement in his Presidential Address is as clear as it is weighty, and we cite it in full from the report given in the *Times* of October 17 :

> Dr. Garbett said he was frequently asked for advice on the conditions imposed by the Roman Catholic Church before one of its members could marry an Anglican or any other Christian who did not belong to that Church. A mixed marriage of this nature must be taken in the presence of a Roman Catholic priest if it were to be recognized as valid by that Church, and this was permitted only after consent had been given by both parties to the following conditions:—First, both sign a document in which they 'solemnly promise and engage that all the children, of both sexes, who may be born of our marriage, shall be baptized in the Catholic Church, and shall be carefully brought up in the knowledge and practice of the Catholic Religion.' Secondly, the non-Roman Catholic party solemnly promised 'that I will not interfere with the religious belief of my future husband or wife and that I will allow him or her full and perfect liberty to fulfil all his or her duties as a member of the Catholic Religion.' On the other side of this document there was printed the request from the parish priest for a dispensation to allow this marriage. This was in Latin, and it restated not only that the above-mentioned pledges had been given, but in addition—and this was not always known—that the Roman Catholic promises to do all within his or her power to induce the other party to embrace the true faith : *promittit pars catholica, se omni quo potest modo conaturam, ut induceretur pars altera ad veram fidem amplectendam.*
>
> I feel it necessary, the Archbishop continued, to warn Anglicans against signing this document, and to ask them to do their utmost to dissuade members of our Church from doing so. It means that while freedom is secured to the Roman Catholic it is denied to the Anglican. It means that Anglican fathers or mothers married to Roman Catholics are deprived of the right to influence the spiritual and religious upbringing of their children. It means disloyalty to the Church of their baptism and of their fathers. It is a humiliating condition asked of the Anglican before marriage with a Roman Catholic. I have known many cases where the Anglican has stood firm and refused to give this pledge, and either the Roman Catholic authorities have not insisted upon it, or, more frequently, the marriage has been taken in one of our churches.
>
> In conclusion, Dr. Garbett said that neither Anglican nor Roman Catholic should be intimidated by any warnings or threats that a mixed marriage in one of our churches would be invalid; it would not indeed be recognized by the Roman Catholic Church, but it would be a marriage in the sight of God and in accordance with the laws both of the Church and the State of this realm. He had quoted the actual terms used in the promise: 'Catholic Church,' 'Catholic Religion.' In the context they were obviously intended to mean the 'Roman Catholic Church' and the 'Roman Catholic Religion,' for the Church of England was the historic Catholic Church of this land, and its religion was that of the 'holy Catholic Church' in which its members proclaim their belief whenever they say the Creeds.

In view of the enforcement of the *Ne Temere* Decree some of our British Dominions have passed legislation by which very heavy penalties are imposed on any Roman Catholic who shall openly assert that any non-Roman Catholic partner in a mixed marriage who has not submitted to the *Ne Temere* Decree is not the lawful spouse of the Roman Catholic whom he or she has married. Furthermore, anyone who shall dare to assert that the children of such a marriage are not legitimate is liable to a similar legal penalty.

A Martyr for the Truth

A contest of considerable significance has recently concluded in Roman Catholic circles in this country. It terminated in a martyrdom. The martyr was not burnt at the stake, but frozen out —the modern method.

The martyr, the Rev. Dr. Simcox, has been Professor of Canon Law for the last twenty-three years in St. Edmund's College, Ware, the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical seminary for the Archdiocese of Westminster.

It came about thus. During the Education Campaign of 1942-3, when the Roman Catholic authorities desired to receive liberal financial support for their schools from the Ministry of Education, Cardinal Hinsley stated publicly that the Roman Catholic Church recognized the moral right of all parents to educate their children in their own religion. This statement created profound difficulty for Dr. Simcox. He knew, as a Professor of Canon Law, that this was contradicted both by pronouncements and precedents of the Papal Church. He hoped that it might be true and receive the support of a decision of the Holy Office in its favour, but he was far from sure that this would be the case. After much hesitation he wrote a letter to the *Catholic Herald* in which he raised this crucial issue. On the publication of the letter he received a private letter from Cardinal Hinsley formally asking him to desist from the controversy and charging him with being an 'agent of confusion.' Dr. Simcox obeyed, but his conscience troubled him. He was a Professor of Canon Law and his business was both to know the truth and to teach it. He felt he must get an authoritative answer on the issue. So he pressed the Cardinal for an answer but received none.

Dr. Simcox discussed the matter with Mr. Arnold Lunn, Mr. Christopher Hollis and Canon Mahoney, all of whom defended the Cardinal's action. Cardinal Hinsley having died meanwhile, Mr. Lunn reported the matter to the present Archbishop of

Westminster. The conclusion reached is thus recorded by Dr. Simcox in a letter to the *New Statesman* of March 17, 1945:

> 'Ultimately, in the case of Canon Mahoney, Mr. Hollis and the Archbishop himself, the defence narrowed down to the position that, while they did not deny or dispute the fact that I was right on the point of doctrine, they considered that I had no right as a priest to maintain the truth (as I wished to do by publishing the documents relating to the case) against the authority of the Archbishop (who opposed publication).'

This decision further increased the religious difficulties of Dr. Simcox, for what had taken place seemed to decide

> 'that a priest had no right to maintain truth against the authority of his bishop.'

There was also the further question:

> 'Will the Archbishop still decline, as the late Cardinal did, to teach Catholics the actual doctrines taught in our Church by standard theologians hitherto?'

Dr. G. G. Coulton, in a Foreword to Dr. Simcox's *Apologia* published under the title *Is the Roman Catholic Church a Secret Society?*[1] thus summarizes the subsequent development of this

> 'Dr. Simcox filled for more than twenty years a Professorship at St. Edmund's Seminary, Ware. He has no personal quarrel with colleagues or superiors; by their own testimony, he has honourably fulfilled his honourable duties. But, after long discussion and still longer reflexion, he has been driven to resign by a conscience which can no longer suffer, if only in silent acquiescence, what seems a manifest falsehood, scarcely separable from the taint of positive mendacity, at this conjuncture where the Roman Hierarchy is pressing to gain a predominant position during the coming years of Reconstruction.' (p.v.)

Significant Decision by the 'Catholic Society of University College,' London

Arising out of the case of Professor Simcox, the Catholic Society of University College, London, on May 7, 1946, staged a debate on the following motion:

> 'That Catholics ought not to maintain that non-Catholics have a natural right to practise, teach, or propagate their religion.'

Mr. Warren Sandell (a Roman Catholic lay scholar) at the request of the President of the Society, Mr. Raymond Winch, defended the thesis with testimonies cited from the pronouncements of the infallible Papal pontiffs. The ruthless scholastic logic of his arguments admit of only one conclusion as to what has been the authoritative teaching of the Papal Church on this issue.

We have only space here to cite from the opening and closing important case:

[1] Second edition. Published by Watts & Co., December 1946; price 2*s*. net.

sentences of Mr. Sandell's speech. Mr. Sandell believed that his invitation to defend the thesis to be due to a most extraordinary situation existing in the Roman Catholic community in this country to-day. With astonishing courage he averred :

> 'I attributed this extraordinary state of affairs to the teaching about parental rights promulgated since the days of Cardinal Bourne by the Catholic bishops of England. To win support for their campaign to secure more money from public funds for Catholic schools they have openly proclaimed that all parents, and not merely Catholic parents, have a *natural right* to bring up their children in their own religion, no matter what that religion may be. We might, of course, infer from this that the English Hierarchy were infected with liberalism or modernism. But I do not believe, Sir, that the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster is infected with liberalism or modernism. Nor do I believe that the English bishops are infected with liberalism or modernism. On the contrary, they know perfectly well that their public teaching in this matter is flatly contrary to the authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church and the Holy See. Thus they have deliberately deceived not only persons outside the Church, but also — what is far worse — the faithful themselves, to whom they are under the most sacred obligations to teach the truth' (p. 47).

Mr. Sandell concluded his argument as follows :

> 'Thus, contrary to what has in recent years been taught openly in this land by the Catholic bishops and clergy, the Church condemns the proposition that parents as such have a natural right to bring up their children in the tenets of a false religion. To the Church, truth and error are as food and poison, and man's estimation of them cannot change their nature.'

The President of the Society, Mr. Raymond Winch, replied to Mr. Warren Sandell. If Mr. Sandell's speech is characterized by *saeva indignatio*, *mitis sapientia* is the dominant note of the reply of Mr. Winch. His positive conclusions are thus summarized in the two following paragraphs :

> 'The Church of God is not an earthly society. It is in the world but not of it. Its rule is not like that of the nations—for Christ's Kingdom is a heavenly Kingdom. The nations rule their subjects with force, but those who are called out to be members of the Divine *Ecclesia* are under no physical constraint, for Christ put them under none. They are bound only by love—love freely given and freely received. It was by the power of love that Christ called and held His apostles, and it is only by that same power of love that the faithful are united in the Church, and it is because of that love which we must have for those others whom God also loves that we are called to be missionaries for the Faith. And if we labour *for* love we must labour *with* love.
>
> 'As Christ had no need of the legions of angels which His father might send Him, so His bride the Church—so long as she remains a constant spouse—can have no use for physical violence. The Church is commissioned to denounce sin and error, but she can speak only to the hearts and minds of men. Beyond the potent mildness of that persuasion and rebuke which springs from love, she has only one lawful weapon

which can, in any sense, be called physical—the blood of her martyrs.' (*Is the Roman Catholic Church a Secret Society?* pp. 47-53.)

If Mr. Winch's speech truly reflects the convictions of the Catholic Society of University College, London, and if Mr. Sandell was right in maintaining that the Roman Hierarchy in this country is not modernist, then the Roman Catholic Church in this country is faced with a crisis, for it is perfectly clear that a number of her younger educated laity are becoming modernist; and their modernism is of the English, not of the Continental, type. It is essentially a New Testament Modernism in which Christian love is the supreme value and is united to Christian freedom and Christian truth, its congenial correlatives.

What is the Holy Office going to do about it? Will it, like the English Cardinals, take refuge in silence?

In the light of its President's speech the unanimous consent of the Catholic Society of University College means the rejection of the Roman Church's age-long claim to use the secular arm to enforce its spiritual authority. This claim may be said to go back to St. Augustine's use of the text, 'Compel them to come in,' as a justification for summoning the Imperial Legions to crush the Donatists in North Africa. Will the Holy Office, in spite of Papal pronouncements and precedents, publicly and unflinchingly authorize this essentially Christian policy and declare that henceforth always and everywhere it must be the policy and practice of the Roman Church?

If in spite of difficulties which it may create for itself in the sphere of Papal infallibility the Roman Church dare to affirm this policy it will give a moral and spiritual vitality to Roman Catholicism which may well bring about the re-birth of Catholic Christendom. Should such a result ensue, Professor Simcox's fearless moral protest will have been well worth the pain it has caused him.

Personal Tribute to Dr. Coulton from a Roman Catholic Historian

Professor Simcox's challenge to the Roman Hierarchy in this country has been the means of eliciting a sincere expression of gratitude and regard for the contribution made by Dr. G. G. Coulton as an ecclesiastical controversialist. This expression of gratitude and regard comes from Mr. Warren Sandell, a Roman Catholic scholar, in a letter addressed by him to Dr. Griffin, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster. He writes:

'I venture, as a layman, to approach you on a matter which for a long time has been a cause of great concern to some, if not to many Catholics. It is the dishonesty of much of our propaganda, notably in our presentation of history, and in the campaign for Catholic schools as this has been conducted at least from the days of the late Cardinal Bourne. . . . Your Grace will, however, be aware that the question of truth in Catholic history has been given prominence in the controversies in which Dr. G. G. Coulton and Cardinal Gasquet have been perhaps the chief, though by no means the only protagonists. Owing to the over-emphasis given to one instance of the Cardinal's persistence in demonstrated falsehood, an impression has perhaps been given that this is the only important example of the Cardinal's dishonesty. Such an impression would be entirely erroneous. I have been engaged for many years now on independent historical research, without any special reference to the possible errors of Cardinal Gasquet or any other writer. Yet I have found three instances of major falsification of documents by the Cardinal, instances which Dr. Coulton has not included even in his almost interminable lists of similar errors. It would be wholly wrong to attribute all the Cardinal's errors to dishonesty. Many are plainly due to an incompetence which may well seem incredible in a writer who made so great a parade of his researches and who acquired such prestige as an historian even in non-Catholic circles. . . .

The Abbé Constant has repeated in a fairly recent work most of Gasquet's errors, evidently without question, and in one instance has (for the sake of round numbers in certain statistics) even augmented the error, which already was sufficiently grotesque. Such indeed is the spirit of ignorance and advocacy which informs our presentation of history to-day, whether it be in text-books, serious treatises, or ephemeral articles and public speeches to Catholic audiences.

And what is the essential evil in all this? Surely it is the fundamental dishonesty of mind, the indifference to truth, which marks not the bad or indifferent Catholic, but the most zealous. One result has been that Dr. Coulton has been pursued with a degree of malignity, falsehood, and injustice which is a dishonour to the Christian name and a scandal to the Catholic Church. Indeed, I first made his acquaintance some fifteen years ago as a result of writing to him to disavow, as a Catholic, a peculiarly mendacious attack made upon him by Hilaire Belloc. I also wrote temperately to Belloc, and received a reply in his own hand, which made no attempt at justification, but whose gist was that Dr. Coulton was mentally deranged — than which few statements could be more absurdly or outrageously false. . . .

As a layman I have nothing to lose by publishing my opinions in these matters. But because some twenty-five years ago I gave up much (like many another) to become a Catholic, I think I have a moral right to protest at the system which imposes heavy sacrifices on any of the clergy who run counter to the policy endorsed by their ecclesiastical superiors. Although he is not the only one, the Reverend Dr. J. V. Simcox is a recent example.' (p. 33f. of *Is the Roman Catholic Church a Secret Society?*)

This testimony does as much honour to him who gives it as to him who receives it, and it gives us no little pleasure to re-publish it.

IN MEMORIAM

KIRSOPP LAKE

1872 - 1946

The recent death of Kirsopp Lake in his Californian home, whither he had retired in 1938 as Professor Emeritus after a strenuous academic career of nearly a quarter of a century in Harvard University, has deprived the scholastic world of a brilliant personality. Born in 1872, educated at St. Paul's and Lincoln College, Oxford, his university career, although respectable, hardly promised the reputation which he later achieved as a scholar. It was, we believe, the influence exerted over him by the original and fearless personality of F. C. Conybeare, Fellow of University College, Oxford, which was the main factor in Lake's development. It was Conybeare who initiated Lake into the mysteries and problems of New Testament palaeography and textual criticism.

Ordained in 1895, Lake became curate of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, in 1897 and Professor of the New Testament in Leiden University in 1904 in succession to that amazingly brilliant scholar Rendel Harris. He terminated his influential career at Leiden by becoming Professor of Early Christian History in Harvard University in 1914, where on his arrival he preached a sermon in Harvard Chapel in which he compared his own career to that of the Pilgrim Fathers who sought their religious freedom by emigrating from England to Holland but in time, realizing the limitations of their continental abode, resolved to seek their spiritual home in New England. Lake, like the Pilgrim Fathers, would gladly have remained in England. But his intellectual originality combined with the fearlessness of his utterances—he was neither a 'safe man' nor a 'yes man'—proved detrimental to his promotion both in academic and ecclesiastical circles.

Lake's Inaugural Lecture at Leiden (published in England), in which he concluded that the Triune Baptismal Formula in *Matt.* xxviii, 19 was no part of the original Gospel but an interpolation, and that the reference to water in the discourse of Jesus with Nicodemus in *John* iii was also an interpolation, did him no good in English clerical circles. In 1914 some of his friends sought to secure his appointment to a Canonry in Westminster Abbey, but Mr. Asquith, having read Lake's volume *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, decided that he could not nominate him.

Although a deeply attached member of the Church of England, Lake resolved when emigrating to the U.S.A. to keep himself free from all ecclesiastical denominational entanglements, but retained his name in *Crockford*. Henceforth he was an ecclesiastical free lance.

In the period which preceded his emigration to the U.S.A. Lake gave unstinted and generous support to the Modern Churchmen's Union, of which he was a vice-president for many years. The holding of our first annual Modern Churchmen's Conference in 1914 at Ripon originated with him. I recall his travelling from London to Ripon and back again the same day in order to discuss the project and practical plans for its realization.

When the *Modern Churchman* was founded early in 1911, Lake most generously offered his illuminating and arresting studies, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, for publication in the successive monthly issues of our magazine. I should most gladly have accepted his generous offer but for the fact that the *Interpreter*, edited by Hewlett Johnson, was then engaged in trying to popularize modern critical study of the Bible among the English clergy, and I had no desire that the *Modern Churchman* should appear as a rival to the *Interpreter*.

Although Lake had achieved a great reputation as a New Testament textual critic before emigration to America, he increased his reputation by his co-operation with Dr. Foakes Jackson and other scholars in bringing out the monumental contribution to the understanding of Christian origins, entitled *The Beginnings of Christianity* (five volumes). In later years his publications have been almost entirely concerned with the technicalities of New Testament textual criticism, and in this department the competent and devoted co-operation of Mrs. Lake has played no small part.

In his earlier stages of New Testament textual research Lake was much attracted by the Western Text, so called, and thought its authority in a number of cases was to be preferred to the Neutral Text of Westcott and Hort. But he confessed to me in his later years that further research had led him steadily away from that position.

Educated English readers who are not technical scholars but may desire to benefit from Lake's teaching cannot do better than read his *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, their Motive and Origin*, *The Stewardship of Faith*, and his hand-book to the criticism of the New Testament. This last, published a few years ago (not to be confused with an earlier little book by him on the same theme), is far the best text-book for those who wish to understand what is meant by New Testament textual and literary criticism.

Professor Manson, in a contribution to the *Times* of November 23, admirably summarizes Lake's contribution to the literary and historical criticism of the New Testament.

[1] The best examples are *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* and the last two volumes of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. His work here is out-

> standing for immense knowledge of the relevant literature and lucid presentation of the most complex problems. Even where his solutions are unacceptable, his statement of the case is always a clarification of the issues.'

Lake as a personality could only be really understood by his intimates. I can think of no better words with which to introduce him to others than Hamlet's soliloquy on Yorick:

> 'Alas, poor Yorick! I knew him, Horatio; a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy. . . .'

Lake possessed a droll sense of humour exhibited in unexpected ways. Before his ordination, the Principal of Cuddesdon urged him to make his confession. Lake asked the Principal to give his reasons. The Principal responded with a lengthy statement. At its conclusion Lake said, 'Your argument is convincing, but there is an insuperable obstacle in my case: I cannot remember anything to confess.'

I first met Lake when as Professor he came back to St. Mary's, where I was then curate, to preach at a morning service. He had no robes, and I gave him a cassock, surplice, hood and scarf, but apologized for having no girdle. Lake said to me with great solemnity, 'This is most unfortunate; there is, as you know, a collect to be said when one puts on the girdle. How am I to say the collect when I have no girdle?' It was only later when I came to know him that I realized that he was pulling my leg — but 'cheerfulness,' in Izaak Walton's phrase, 'would come breaking through'!

He coined many brilliant epigrams which have since been attributed to others. His humour, though usually genial, exhibited at times a sardonic quality. A group of Liberal Churchmen were seriously discussing what precisely Canon Henson meant by the phrase *ex animo* when, before his consecration as Bishop of Hereford, he declared to Archbishop Davidson that he affirmed all the articles of the Creed *ex animo* — a term which had been deliberately omitted from the Declaration of Subscription in 1865. Lake terminated the discussion by observing that he suspected that Henson's meaning was more correctly expressed by another Latin phrase, *Cum grano salis*.

Lake was an arresting public speaker. Lucid in exposition, he appeared at his best in debate. At times profoundly emotional, his emotion did not betray itself in sentimentality of phrase (which he abhorred) nor in any change in the tone of his voice, which remained firmly under control, but tears trickled down his cheeks.

At Leiden he quickly learnt to lecture in Dutch. When I asked him if he preached in Dutch, he replied that preaching needed a

command of the finer *nuances* of language and delivery which as a foreigner he could never hope to achieve.

To immense industry and scientific accuracy, Lake added originality and imagination and a deep spiritual perception. It was perception rather than emotion. His Johnsonian determination to clear both his mind and his speech from cant precluded his giving expression to emotion except on the rarest occasions.

As the years passed dogmatic theology and ecclesiastical institutions increasingly lost for Lake their value. They seemed to him to belong more and more to the past and to have little chance of surviving into the future. What form the Christian Religion would assume in the future was beyond his power to foresee. Yet he was quite convinced of the value of mystical religion, which was for him no mere emotionalism or escapism but a pathway into reality. This is expressed in the concluding words of his volume of lectures entitled *The Religion of Yesterday and To-morrow*:

> 'The mystic claims that he has found "another way," which is not the way of the senses, yet is really his, and his reason can study it just as it studies the evidence of his eyes. It is the experience which makes men feel that at certain moments, which for most are very rare, they have become conscious of the unity of all life. The eternal strife between object and subject is over. That is the experience of workers who lose themselves in their work, of artists who lose themselves in the beauty which they feel, of those in whom friendship has leapt the barriers of self, and of saints the eye of whose soul has been able to endure the vision of the One. It is this experience which is the basis of mysticism. It is not an emotion: it is a different form of consciousness. Amid so much that is vague and doubtful in my own vision of the religion of to-morrow this stands out clearly for me.'

H.D.A.M

ALEXANDER GRISWOLD CUMMINS
1869-1946

The Protestant Episcopal Church of U.S.A. has lost from the ranks of its leaders an outstanding personality by the death of Alexander Griswold Cummins. Born in Smyrna, Del., in 1869, a member of an old colonial family, possessed of a substantial fortune, he resolved to enter the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for which he received his final training at the General Theological Seminary, New York. Ordained in 1892, he was appointed to a curacy in the New York diocese, and in that diocese he pursued his ministerial career until his recent retirement. It was at Poughkeepsie, where he was appointed rector in 1900 and laboured for forty-six years, that he became known as an enterprising, eloquent and greatly beloved pastor. At the outset of his ministry he achieved a daring reform—how daring only a parochial

clergyman can realize—when he replaced the mouldering heaps of 'the rude forefathers of the hamlet' which surrounded the parish church by a charming landscape garden. Another parochial reform was the building of a Sunday school which in its arrangement and equipment became the model for many others in America.

In 1901 he founded the *Chronicle* (published at Poughkeepsie), a Protestant Episcopal monthly which he edited with fearlessness and humour. Its avowed purpose was to maintain the liberal evangelical ideals of the American Church against the rising tide of a detrimental Anglo-Catholicism. With this purpose in view he also became founder and treasurer of the Protestant Episcopal Church League. In a document entitled *Let's Look at the Record*, 'published at the request of prominent laymen of fourteen Protestant Episcopal dioceses,' he analysed and summarized the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in U.S.A. as he saw it, and emphasized the insidious tendencies and policies which seemed to him to threaten the influence of his beloved Church. After a hard struggle for survival that Church seemed in the latter half of the nineteenth century to have every prospect of becoming the most influential Reformed Communion in U.S.A. It was growing rapidly, not simply in numbers and in the increase of its parishes and dioceses, but in the sphere of religious leadership and social influence. Many of its clergy, drawn from old colonial families, were men of standing and culture who in any other sphere of life would have been men of mark. An increasing number of laymen of the educated classes enlarged the membership of the Church: its philanthropic, social and educational institutions were in the front rank. The document to which we have referred presents the situation thus:

> 'It [the Church] became a national asset . . . Its increasing momentum seemed to promise that it would become the largest Protestant church in the United States.'

Then there came from overseas the Oxford Movement resolved to 'de-Protestantize' the American Church. Wherever that movement has gained control,

> 'Roman teaching and practices prevail. As a result, thousands of loyal Episcopalians have been driven from the church they love. . . . As the Roman Catholic Church drives hard to control the ecclesiastical destinies of the United States, Anglo-Catholics, either intentionally or stupidly, play right into the hands of the Roman hierarchy through their pro-papalism. . . . Wherever Anglo-Catholics infiltrate themselves into liberal church organizations they methodically wreck them.'

What we have cited from this document sufficiently indicates the apprehension and antagonism excited by Anglo-Catholicism which inspired the resolution of Dr. Cummins to check its influ-

ence and thwart its machinations. Although he had behind him the support of many of the laity, yet, Anglo-Catholicism being an essentially clerical movement, he had the sorrow of witnessing an increasing number of the clergy and bishops of his cherished Church directly or indirectly supporting its menacing influence.

But his life was a many-sided one. He was known as the friend of every good cause in the country and his own generosity and powers of eloquent appeal enabled him to secure much support for philanthropic enterprises. On the completion of his ministerial jubilee he was publicly congratulated by President Roosevelt. He was well known in English Church circles, and in pre-war days was a constant visitor to this country. He preached in Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral, Canterbury Cathedral, St. Giles', Edinburgh, and many other of our great basilican churches.

He was a Vice-President of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and his genial humour and social gifts made him very popular as a member of our annual conferences. We shall miss 'the white cockerel.' Like the white plume of Navarre, he was always to be found where the Protestant cause was in need of a champion.

H.D.A.M.

EDITH DOWELL.

The passing of Edith Dowell breaks a link with the past — both the past of the recent war and the more distant past beyond the memory of any but the oldest of us. Hers was a great soul utterly devoted to the cause of truth whether in the ordinary everyday hurly-burly of this world's troublous life or in the more specialized sphere of Liberal Theology.

What the Modern Churchmen's Union owes to Miss Dowell is only known to a few. For many years, when she occupied our central office in London, she kept in touch with members all the world over. The arrival of a subscription did not mean merely the sending of a receipt or an entry in a book: it was the occasion for a personal letter. She 'counted time by heart-throbs, not in figures on a dial.' We know from the letters of those in distant parts how valuable this personal contact could be. The Union was her whole being, and when we were obliged to close down the London office, we really brought her life to an end. She pursued her duties regardless of dropping bombs ('those murderers are overhead again,' she wrote to me from the middle of a raid), sometimes under conditions of great ill-health and pain.

Some of the office furniture was her own and she kept a little library of books, which she was always willing to lend to others. She had her own way of doing things — in particular of keeping the books of the Union. It took a clever man some time to fathom the mysteries of her accountancy — but the tally was correct!

As became a member of the Nelson family, she was an individualist to the core — of such and for such our Union exists.

On my last visit to her she repeated her *confessio fidei*: 'I believe in the Humanity of Jesus and in the Divinity of Man' — no bad foundation for a thoroughly orthodox faith. At the end, she was longing for release. R.I.P.

R. B. Henderson.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND TO-DAY—SOME PERSPECTIVES

By H. Powys Greenwood, M.A.

'WHIRL is king, and has driven out Zeus.' This quotation from Aristophanes was chosen by Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his remarkable book *A Preface to Morals*, to serve as a motto for our age. Never before in human history, he maintains, have disruptive uncertainties in the whole domain of what we call culture, or civilization—in politics, economic relations, social life, ethics, and above all in religion—penetrated to such wide circles of humanity or so deeply into the inner consciousness of the individual man and woman.

This is no doubt a sweeping statement which many historians would be disposed to question. There have been other ages of turmoil and transition; the Reformation and the break-up of the Roman Empire are obvious instances. In the age of Pericles we are told that

> 'among educated men everything was in dispute: political sanctions, literary values, religious convictions, even the possibility of reaching any truth about anything.'

It is quite certain, however, that we are living in an epoch when, as General Smuts has put it, 'the great caravan of humanity is on the march,' and it does not look as though even an oasis were in sight.

One of the most interesting, and certainly one of the most comprehensive, of the attempts made by historical philosophers to obtain an insight into the nature of our age by the method of historical analogy is that of Oswald Spengler. In *The Decline of the West* he maintains with a wealth of argument and illustration that to find a true historical parallel for the present juncture in Western civilization it is necessary to go back to the classical world before the establishment of the Roman Empire. He shows the growth of towns at the expense of the farms, the rise of capitalism, the extension of international trade and finance, developments of nationalism, of democracy, of tyranny, even attempts at the abolition of war through international organization, and underlying it all a dissolution of popular religion and traditional morality with a vast and searching enquiry into the meaning of life. Against the background of a colossal canvas on which he finds room for practically all civilizations known to historical research, he tries to demonstrate that all civilizations tend to pass, at a late stage in their development, through a phase of this kind, which generates

such an intolerable strain that an end has to be put to it by what he calls 'Caesarism'—a unity of culture imposed as a rule by some dominating power. In the classical world the strain was removed in the political sphere by the *Pax Romana*, and some three centuries later an end was put to the intellectual and spiritual chaos by the victory of Christianity.

There is no doubt that Spengler's parallel is striking. There are, of course, many weaknesses in his theory. He shows a Procrustian determination to fit his facts to it; he strives to idealize Prussia; he stubbornly denies meaning—particularly in a moral sense—to the world process: and he tends to ignore the interactions of the great civilizations upon one another. None the less it is difficult to resist his main conclusion that the civilization of the Western world must be struggling towards a consummation of this kind. Many other thinkers besides Spengler, too, have pointed in the same direction. The implications of the Hegelian dialectic are obvious; so are those of Marxism. General Smuts, in expounding his philosophy of 'Holism,' writes of a

> 'rhythmic movement in the whole Universe from the more or less homogeneous to the heterogeneous; from heterogeneous multiplicity again to greater, more advanced harmony, to a harmonious co-operative ordered structural unity.'

That the world, and Western civilization in particular, needs 'ordered structural unity' is evident. The struggle for it is inherent in the situation. Not only the attempts to organize some form of world government, but perhaps even more the two great wars with their unexampled intensity, show that the problem of the 'Caesarism' of Western civilization cannot be evaded.

The appalling danger of this situation lies not merely in the obvious threat of physical destruction in an atomic age, but perhaps even more in the fact that the whole spiritual future of the human race hangs in the balance. Hitler's 'Caesarism,' his thousand-year Reich, was no fantastic dream, but something which came very near to being realized. Upon the principles which govern the achievement of the ultimate synthesis of Western civilization, the destiny of man on this planet, long after that civilization itself is but a memory, is likely to depend.

In the synthesis of classical civilization politics led the way and religion followed. The importance of political and cultural unification under the world empire of Rome for the rise of Christianity is strongly emphasized by Harnack in his great work, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*. Together with the Hellenizing of the East and in part also of the West, it resulted in a comparative unity of language and ideas. The growth and security of

international traffic under its aegis provided indispensable facilities for Christian missionaries. Its associations and provincial organizations afforded a useful model for the integration of the nascent Church. Above all, perhaps, the unity, prestige and magnificence of Rome favoured the great conception of a transcendent heavenly unity, which lay at the very root of Christian monotheism. The conditions were ideal for the spread of a religion which, in contrast to Mohammedanism for example, started by being purely other-worldly, and, as Troeltsch shows so clearly in *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, took centuries to develop its social and political implications. Half the work had as it were been done already. Primitive Christianity could thus afford to ignore a world whose stable political, social and economic organization allowed the battle to be fought wholly in the domain of the spirit.

To-day the whole great work of achieving unity remains to be done. One of the most striking differences between the situation confronting the primitive Christians and that which Christianity is facing to-day is that no such isolation of the inner life is possible. The crisis is one and indivisible. Religion, moreover, lies at its very root. The forces which are seeking to dominate the world carry with them the most far-reaching religious implications. They set out to utilize all the spiritual forces in man. They affect the inmost depths of the human soul; they dominate that 'inner side of civilization' with which religion has often been identified. And at the same time they are directly and indissolubly connected with every aspect of life.

That is the meaning of the profoundly significant word 'totalitarian.' Nazism and Communism, the typical movements of the age, have often been called the New Paganism. They identify Caesar with God far more closely than the old Paganism ever did. This is not only because they strive to subordinate all human activity to their interests—art, literature, economics, science, philosophy and so on—but above all because they need, as the ancient Caesars did not, to draw strength from that vital part of man's consciousness where his religion has its being. Their aim is 'holist,' in Smuts' sense, and they are 'holist' as a result, clear symptoms of the inner urge of the world-process to bring forth a whole.

What place will there be in that whole for Christianity? That will depend upon the extent to which it is able to integrate itself into the whole range of political, social and cultural development. It cannot afford in such a period to disregard the great secular struggle. When Troeltsch, writing before the war of 1914-18, formulated the social problem of the Christian Churches, he stated

that it was to harmonize with the main formative powers of civilization, and above all with the State and Society, 'in such a way that together they will form a unity of civilization.' The problem remains as Troeltsch put it, only it is far more acute and urgent. The possibility of a union of despotic barbarism being formed in which the religion of Christ is simply 'liquidated' looms plainly ahead. The task before Christianity is to ensure that the offering consummated on Calvary is not finally rejected.

In this task religion, dealing as it does with absolutes on the one hand and the innermost being of man on the other, must claim the lead. It is a tragedy that precisely at this juncture the influence of Christian thought seems to be at its lowest ebb for centuries. As Alfred Noyes puts it in *The Unknown God*, 'by a great part of the modern world the historic religion of Christendom has been not so much abandoned as allowed to lapse.' Modern man has what Professor Julian Huxley describes as a 'God-shaped blank in his consciousness.' In terms of the parallel with the ancient world, Christianity to-day would almost seem to take the place of Paganism, whose decay left a blank which the new religion was able to fill.

It is certain that the blank will not endure to-day any more than it did two thousand years ago. 'No psychic value,' writes Jung in *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 'can disappear without being replaced by another of equivalent intensity.' The human soul, like Nature, abhors a vacuum. Here is another reason for the success of the totalitarian movements. They replace the vanishing spiritual values with racial or class mysticism. They set up new gods which demand and receive an intensity of worship which puts most Christianity of the day to shame and can only be regarded as a measure of man's need. Nor can Communism in particular be denied ethical worth. In a striking article in the *Congregational Quarterly* for October, 1945, Professor William Band writes of the Chinese Communists as showing in the practical ethics of their life 'a spiritual strength which would be the envy of more religious men.' In fact, of course, those Communists are to all intents and purposes religious men, whatever we may think of their religion. The God-shaped blank in their consciousness has been filled by the beatific vision of the classless State leading to a Marxian world-order.

Elsewhere the blank remains. In those countries where the Nazi-Fascist idols have been overthrown it has become an aching void. The spiritual needs of the twentieth century are no less than those of the first. But whereas the early Church found older religions which were everywhere in decay, Christianity is to-day confronted by a vacuum caused primarily by its own loss of grip.

Thus in spite of the vast and majestic organizations of the Christian Churches, their task is probably even more formidable than that of the apostles and the early Fathers. Only a profound inner renewal will regain the lead for Christianity and enable it to refill the blank before it is occupied by one or other of the totalitarian ideologies.

Yet it is precisely this power of inner renewal which has characterized Christianity from the beginning.

> 'Remember,' wrote William Temple, 'the supreme wonder of the Christian Church is that always in moments when it seemed most dead, out of its own body there has sprung up new life, so that in age after age it has renewed itself, and age after age its renewal has carried the world forward into new stages of progress, as it will do for us in our day if only we give ourselves in devotion to its Lord, and take our place in its service.'

The central principles of the Christian religion seem plainly designed to cement a crumbling world. Love is in the last analysis the great integrating force of the *cosmos*, and it is the core of the religion of Jesus. From His idea of the Fatherhood of God, transcending all barriers of nation and race, all ideals of the brotherhood of man are ultimately derived. In working towards a true world-order Christians to-day have a majestic conception of transcendent unity to serve as a model and a foundation. They can in a sense reverse the procedure of the early Christians, who used the empire of Caesar on earth as a basis and an illustration for their teaching of the Kingdom of God in heaven.

In many respects, in fact, the situation to-day is a reversal of that in the first few centuries. When St. Paul set out on his missionary journeys he faced, as we have seen, a world enjoying political and economic cohesion, but which, in the chaos of contending religions and philosophies, showed increasing pre-occupation with the salvation of individual souls. According to Troeltsch the one factor conditioned the other; it was largely the submission to the world domination of the Empire which drove the individual into his own inner life. The phenomenal spread of the mystery religions showed the trend of the age. They offered union with the gods, personal salvation, individual survival. The second of the five causes for the success of Christianity enumerated by Gibbon was 'the doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important truth.'

The tinge of irony in the tone of the great eighteenth-century sceptic foreshadows the change that has come about. Modern man is not merely sceptical about individual survival; he has come to demand another kind of salvation altogether. The 'mystery religions' of to-day are the totalitarian movements, with their offer of

a secular millennium. It is quite obvious that this attempt to project the Kingdom of God into future *time* — which Dean Inge calls the modern heresy — has an appeal to great masses of people. Partly, perhaps, it finds its responsive chord in an almost instinctive feeling that the major problems of human society are coming up once more for decision; partly it is a new form of one of the oldest dreams of man, a dream embodied alike in stories of a lost Eden and in prophecies of a Messianic age. There is at any rate no doubt that it corresponds with deep-seated needs and constitutes a challenge which Christianity must meet.

Millennial ideas of this type draw their strength largely from the twin visions of science and of humanism, which dawned with the Reformation and Renaissance and culminated in nineteenth-century theories of progress and evolution. Science showed us a 'grand sequence of events,' as Darwin described it, offering a prospect of life, through man, consciously mastering the Universe. Humanism dreamt of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, of a 'brotherhood of man,' of a New Order. One of the tragedies of the present situation is that although neither of these conceptions is inherently opposed to Christianity and both in fact grew up within the Christian tradition, they have departed from it more and more, a consummation for which the obscurantism of many Churches is perhaps as much to blame as any of the scientists and humanists themselves. Gradually both science and humanism came to be associated with the idea of man achieving salvation on his own. An attitude of mind developed in which man could sing his Me Deum in Swinburne's words : 'Glory to man in the highest, for man is the master of things.' It was not far from this to self-deification — to the worship of Adolf Hitler and the Aryan tribe, or Lenin and the world proletariat.

Swinburne was not wholly wrong. Man is the master of things. The terrible lesson which the wrath of God is driving home to our war-torn and famine-stricken world is that he is not the master of man. The dream that man has dreamt will vanish as though it had never been if he destroys himself by the simple and very scientific process described in the first chapter of the *Epistle to the Romans* : 'And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things that are not fitting.' It is a peculiarly apt dispensation of Providence that the great invention which, if report is to be believed, opens up to the human race the prospect of conquering astronomical space and thus evading their inevitable doom in a cooling solar system, should at the same time present a much nearer prospect of total destruction. It has been remarked that the

discovery of the atomic bomb is the first occasion on which scientists as a body have shown real fear. While it would be too much to say that the insufficiency of humanism as a moral and spiritual basis for the control of the vast forces science is unleashing is universally recognized, yet its authority has been seriously shaken, and one of its greatest prophets, H. G. Wells, writes of 'mind at the end of its tether.'

The prospects of an alliance between science, humanism and religion are better to-day than at any time for the last hundred years. Yet there are tendencies in Christian thought which persist in stigmatizing humanism as the enemy with which no compromise is possible. They forget the example of the Greek Fathers of the Christian Church, who came to terms with the great tradition of Greek thought — the modern parallel to scientific research and humanist philosophy—as soon as the spread of Christianity among the educated classes rendered it necessary. Whether Christianity would have conquered the world without the work of Clement, Origen, and their successors is at any rate questionable. The synthesis thus achieved was well described by Hegel. Oriental religion had brooded upon the infinite. Greek religion had emphasized the finite and sensuous. Christianity included both in a higher unity — the incarnation of the infinite God.

Never was this power of synthesis — which Hegel considered as the chief claim of Christianity to be regarded as the culmination of the history of religion — so badly needed as now. We live in a sort of schizophrenic world of watertight compartments; the further our innumerable lines of thought, research and action are pursued, the more difficult they become to co-ordinate. And the chief bulkhead is the ancient division between the finite and the infinite, the secular and the sacred, the world of time and the world of eternity. It has become so impenetrable that the modern world conducts its affairs to an ever increasing extent as though all beyond it had no existence. It was at the very root of the tragedy of Nazi Germany, which is difficult to conceive without Luther's pietistic insistence on the separation of the world, where Satan reigns, and the realm of God and the spirit. Spengler has a passage which expresses this well.

> 'A ruler who wishes to improve religion in the direction of political, practical purposes is a fool. A sociologist-preacher who tries to bring truth, righteousness, peace and forgiveness into the world of actuality is a fool also. No faith yet has altered the world, and no fact can ever repeat a faith. There is no bridge between directional time and timeless eternity, between the course of history and the existence of a divine world order.'

Here is a stark antithesis to which Hitler and Karl Barth might equally have subscribed.

The problem of Christianity to-day is to bridge the chasm anew, to relate the redemption of human society in this world with the salvation of the individual through union with God in eternity. The lines on which this may be done were perfectly expressed by St. Augustine in another age of disintegration.

> 'Peace and earthly goods,' he writes in the fifteenth chapter of *De Civitate Dei*, 'are good things, and without doubt the gift of God. But if they (of the earthly City) neglect the better things of the heavenly City which are secured by eternal victory and peace never-ending, and so inordinately covet these present good things that they believe them to be the only desirable things, or love them better than those things which are believed to be better—if this be so, then it is necessary that misery follow and ever increase.'

'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.' In one form or another these words have underlain every attempt to apply Christian principles to the life of the world. But never, perhaps, has this truth been so clear; never have 'all these things'—freedom from want, from fear, from disease, from war, from the results of that struggle for existence which has been the law of life itself—shown up so plainly on the horizon. But God must come first: the values of the temporal world must be subordinated to those of the eternal world.

Throughout the history of Christianity millenarianism has existed alongside of the eschatology of eternity, making its strongest appeal to the masses. It played a large part in the Early Church, and even St. Paul did not make any very clear distinction. Certainly it was not the millennium of the totalitarian movements or even of the best of the humanists. It was a supernatural descent of the Kingdom on earth when Christ Himself should reign. But there is obviously a very close relation. Troeltsch traces the millennial idea, which was rejected by the Catholic Church, through the sects of the Reformation to Calvinism and the Free Churches. This stream of Christian thought, he says, produced the only great sociological Christian Unity worthy to be set beside the structure of medieval Catholicism. Its influence on the thought of the Anglo-Saxon races in particular has been profound, and it is associated with the whole group of ideas centring round Liberalism and democracy. In his view, both these main historic forms of the Christian doctrine of society have now spent their force, so that if the present social situation is to be controlled by Christian principles,

> 'thoughts are necessary which have not been thought, and will correspond to this new situation as the older forms met the need of the social situation in earlier ages.'

Modern millennial ideas—the classless State of the Marxist no less than the Brotherhood of Man of the liberal—have, like all the great currents of Western thought, their roots in Christian culture. In this culture was born the unity of Western civilization and in this culture lies the secret of its reintegration, which will alone make possible the establishment of an organic world-order, based on common fundamentals. Perhaps the most hopeful feature of the situation is that Christians all over the world are at last beginning to realize the nature and scope of the task before them.

FORTY YEARS—A RETROSPECT

By the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, M.A., Editor and Contributor,
The Church and the Twentieth Century.

IF you fancy the kind of schematization which is the modern vogue, you may, using Hegelian terminology, say that theological development has been by way of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. For example, the liberal and humanistic interpretation of Jesus was dominant towards the end of the nineteenth century. I believe that there is more to be said for that position than many would now be prepared to admit. If Jesus is to be real for any particular age he must be conceived in terms which are understandable by that age. Not that a universal figure can be entirely comprehended within the current categories of any particular period. I suggest that Glover's little book *The Jesus of History*, a scholarly reverent attempt to present the historical Jesus in terms which appeal to people of to-day, has its uses. What Glover attempts to do ought to be attempted. Then came a violent antithetical movement in reaction against nineteenth century Liberalism in the shape of the eschatological interpretation of Jesus. It is not easy to say what the resulting synthesis will be, for in movements of thought the process of synthesis is apt to be gradual and may not be completed, if ever completed entirely, until a lengthy period has elapsed. When thesis and antithesis clash we experience a ferment during which much controversial heat is engendered. The ferment subsides by imperceptible stages, and the temperature likewise must lessen before even approximately final results crystallize out.

A retrospect over forty years teaches one that not all the truth is to be found in a new movement of thought, though one may gladly admit that it is the proper part of generous youth to fight

valiantly, and, almost inevitably, one-sidedly, for the new vision of truth which it believes itself to have glimpsed. I do not think that we ought to regard controversy as an unmitigated evil even though many of us are temperamentally averse from controversy. What we may properly demand is that the controversialist, on whichever side, should be actuated by an underlying desire for ultimate truth, and should disdain to use any weapon which is inconsistent with rigid truthfulness in thought and in fact. At any rate the past forty years have been years of intense controversy, now and then reaching boiling-point. Looking back, I am convinced that from these controversies has come definite progress. I see controversies ahead. I have reached an age when I have no right to expect to see their issue; but my faith, grounded on past experience, is that, if they are conducted by good true and earnest men, the one victor in the end will be the truth.

Another example of the clash between thesis and antithesis is the rise of Barthianism. In earlier days the kind of immanentism represented by Illingworth's *Divine Immanence* was almost the accepted orthodoxy of the time. Now it is challenged in stentorian tones by, perhaps, the most influential theologian of our own day, Karl Barth, a man of dynamic conviction and profound learning. Thesis and antithesis are here clear enough. I myself can see no possibility of synthesis; but, as we live in the very midst of the resounding clash, perhaps we may not reasonably expect, as yet, to begin to see what the ultimate issue may be.

I need hardly point out that the various movements of thought are interconnected; that, for instance, there is a close relationship between Barthianism and the eschatological school of thought. Barthianism also has affinities with the more radical type of Form Criticism which dissolves the human Jesus into an intangible mist. Barth is not interested in the human Jesus. In fact, he may plausibly be accused of Docetism or Apollinarianism.

Forty years ago, in the year 1905, Professor Sanday summed up the theological position as he then saw it. I do not think that any theologian has since occupied quite the same place as Professor Sanday. We regarded his utterances with profound respect. He stood head and shoulders above most of his contemporaries. He spoke with authority. In 1905 he said that the stage of literary criticism was drawing to its close and that the position reached by Harnack on the authorship, composition and date of the New Testament writings was winning general acceptance. Controversy about the Fourth Gospel, he added, was still sharp and inconclusive. Since his time the defenders of the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, with occasional rallies, have been losing ground. It seems

that the time will shortly come, if it has not already arrived, when the Fourth Gospel will be generally regarded as a mystical or theological treatise by a writer who is unlikely to have been the son of Zebedee. It does not follow that the Fourth Gospel does not embody some material of historical value.

The stage of historical criticism, which follows that of literary criticism was, Sanday said, already in full course when he wrote. That stage is certainly not yet completed. Probably the judicious Sanday would have been not a little startled if he could have foreseen the course which historical criticism has, in fact, followed. Literary criticism had given us *Mark* and *Q* as the basic authorities for the Synoptic Gospels, and Dr. Streeter has more recently distinguished between *L* and *M*, special written sources used by *Luke* and *Matthew* respectively, and has propounded the theory that behind *Luke* lies an earlier edition ('proto-Luke') compiled from *L* and *Q* alone, our present *Luke* resulting from a combination of this earlier edition with matter drawn from *Mark*. There was a natural tendency for the literary critic unconsciously to assume that when he had disclosed the literary sources of the Synoptic Gospels he had reached bed-rock. But his successors have striven to dig deeper and by the methods of what is known as Form Criticism to discover what took place during the period of oral tradition which preceded the compilation or written records.

But long before the Form Critics had got to work, a challenge was thrown down by scholars of the eschatological school. In England it was signalized by the translation into English in 1910 of Albert Schweitzer's book *Von Reimarus Zu Wrede* (*The Quest for the Historical Jesus*), a survey of the developments of German biblical criticism, which had originally appeared in 1906. Schweitzer approached questions connected with the life and teaching of Jesus from a standpoint quite different from that of such literary critics as Harnack. Following Johannes Weiss, he interpreted Jesus in the light of the teaching of those strange Jewish writers, the Apocalyptists. These men, who wrote between the years 200 B.C. and 100 A.D., produced strange pictures compounded of oriental imagination and fantastic symbolism depicting the end of the present age and the dramatic triumph of God over the powers of evil. Much of their material came ultimately from Persian sources. There is, for them, no such thing as growth and development. The triumph of God crashes through in sudden catastrophe. Jesus, according to Schweitzer, thought of himself in terms of the conceptions of these writers. He himself was the mysterious Son of Man of the *Book of Daniel* and the *Book of Enoch*, and, at the same time, the Messiah of prophetic expectation. The supernatural

catastrophe which should annihilate the present world-order and bring in a new heaven and a new earth was at hand. This was the burden of the Gospel of Jesus, the Son of Man who was shortly to be revealed to all men, coming in clouds of glory.

According to Schweitzer a crucial point in the Gospel story is the mission of the Twelve. Jesus expected the end of all things before their return. He sent them out with the assurance, 'Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come.' During their journey the expected tribulations which were to herald the end—hatred, persecution, dissension between brother and brother, father and child—were to come to pass. And then nothing happened. From now on Jesus held that the tribulations were to fall on him alone. That is what he meant when he said that he must give his life a ransom for many. Jesus, according to Schweitzer, was no teacher of morality. At most his ethics were interim ethics, applying only to the brief period which must precede the coming of God.

This brief summary fails to do anything like full justice to Schweitzer's position. Three years before the translation of his book into English, Sanday had given English readers a warmly appreciative account of his theories, and in those days Sanday's word carried great weight. Most of the younger men among those interested in theology, and many of the older as well, went all eschatological. It should be remembered that for the average student Jewish Apocalyptic was a new world. It is then not surprising that many were thrown off their critical balance. They seemed to have regained a supernatural world. The Anglo-Catholic could rejoice in the replacement of a humanistic Jesus by a supernatural being whom he readily identified with the Christ of the altar. 'The Christ of our altars,' cried Canon Lacey, 'is surely the historic Christ; not a thin figure drawn from inadequate materials in the Synoptics.' George Tyrrell in his *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, published in 1913, after his death, rejoiced that the Liberal Protestants had received what seemed to him to be their quietus.

> 'The necessity of finding in Jesus a German Liberal Protestant, guided entirely by the light of sweet nineteenth-century reasonableness, requires us to ignore everything in the Gospel that suggests the visionary or the ecstatic, even though to do so makes the narrative incoherent and unintelligible. . . . A more drastic and objective criticism has shattered the beautiful simplicity of this tidy little system, obtained by the liberal use of the pruning hook.'

It is startling to hear Tyrrell accuse pre-eschatological criticism of an excessive use of the pruning hook. In constructing his picture of the Apocalyptic Christ, Schweitzer leaves St. Luke's Gospel

entirely out of account. That is to use the pruning hook with a vengeance. I doubt whether any of his predecessors were equally drastic with the pruning hook.

Tyrrell thinks that the earlier critics, by ignoring the visionary and ecstatic element in Jesus, had rendered the narrative incoherent and unintelligible. But let Schweitzer himself bear witness to the outcome of his own methods. This is what he says:

> 'Those who are fond of talking about negative theology can find their account here. There is nothing more negative than the result of the critical study of the life of Jesus.'

Yet, perhaps, Schweitzer was not entirely just to himself when he thus spoke of the negative results of his criticism. He was poet and mystic as well as eschatologist, and there is profound religious emotion in his picture of the eschatological Christ.

> 'He was not a teacher nor a casuist: he was an imperious ruler. . . . He comes to us as one unknown, without a name, as of old by the lake-side he came to those men who knew him not. He speaks to us the same word, "Follow thou me," and sets us to the tasks which he has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey him, whether they be wise or simple, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings, which they will pass through in his fellowship, and as an ineffable mystery they shall learn in their own experience who he is.'

No doubt we are all familiar with this passage; but I venture to quote it because it indicates the links between Apocalypticism and two succeeding movements—Barthianism and Form Criticism. Schweitzer speaks of Jesus as he who 'comes to us as one unknown.' To Barth, Jesus is the great Incognito. The whole passage has been echoed by one of the most distinguished English Form Critics in a summary of the results he has reached in applying to the Gospel records the technique of Form Criticism.

As I have said, Sanday gave Schweitzer's' book a great advertisement, and a word of praise from Sanday was of high value in those days. But when the English translation appeared in 1911, Sanday felt impelled to write a letter to *The Guardian* modifying his earlier encomiums.

> 'I cannot say that I can look back with satisfaction to the way in which I wrote on this subject three years ago. I made the mistake of trying to do two things at once — to give some account of Schweitzer, and at the same time to state what I thought could be assimilated from his book. In the double task I cannot think that I was successful.'

These second thoughts of Sanday were symptomatic. Cool and critical examination succeeded the earlier enthusiasm. In the following year Streeter contributed an important appendix to a collection of essays under Streeter's editorship, published in 1911. In it he sought to find out how far 'the apocalyptic eschatology of

he primitive Church really represented the mind of Christ.' He egarded *Q* as prior to *Mark*, and *Mark*, of course, as prior to *Matthew*. He found the apocalyptic language in *Q* lacking in etail and much vaguer than we find in *Mark*. In *Mark* it is nore defined, especially in chapter xiii. *Matthew* proceeds further y way of embellishment and emphasis. He heightens his apocayptic effects, not only by adding but also by omitting matter which is inconsistent with the view that the coming of the Kingdom of God is a future event which will take place in a catastrophic manner. So we trace from *Q* through *Mark* to *Matthew* a progressive heightening of the eschatological colouring. That is, the further you advance from the time of Jesus the more marked and definite becomes the apocalyptic eschatology. That is a matter of plain fact. Proceeding from fact to surmise, though not to vague or baseless surmise, we go on to ask ourselves whether during the period of oral tradition there had not been a development similar to that which we can clearly trace in the written material. Streeter replies that 'a tendency which continued to modify the record of our Lord's sayings even after they had been reduced to writing cannot but have operated previously when memory was unchecked by the written document.' He believes that *Mark* xiii, which dominates the whole of Marcan eschatology and thus the eschatology of *Matthew* and *Luke*, was an early Christian Apocalypse which contained but little matter which we may reasonably ascribe to Jesus' authentic teaching. This evaluation of *Mark* xiii breaches the very citadel of the radical eschatologist.

But it is not my purpose to attempt to disentangle all the threads of the discussion which followed the publication of Schweitzer's book. Looking back, one is struck by the extent to which Streeter anticipated the findings of subsequent English scholarship. He considered it too much of a paradox to maintain that the Apocalyptic which is present to a not inconsiderable extent in the first three Gospels was entirely absent in some form and to some extent in the Master's teaching. He was, however, clear that the nearer we get to the teaching itself the greater is the emphasis on the present, gradual, and internal aspects of the Kingdom and the more marked is the reserve with which the detail of contemporary Apocalyptic is endorsed. It may be that the permanent value of the emphasis which Schweitzer and his school laid on the Apocalyptic element in the Gospel accounts of the life and teaching of Jesus will be seen in future to be by way of a warning not to construct a Jesus according to the fashion of our own age and our own way of thinking. The tendency to do so is inevitable.

It may be well that there should be something to counterbalance it.

Schweitzer's book was translated into English in 1911. Three years later World War No. 1 broke out. The outcome was a widespread social and political disintegration. Thrones crashed, empires fell, and out of the confusion appeared the portentous Union of Soviet Republics. The moral and spiritual effects of the cataclysm were patent, especially in defeated Germany. Brigadier J. H. Morgan, who, as British Military Representative on the Inter-Allied Council of the Control Commission for the Disarmament of Germany, was in an almost unique position to observe what was happening, has given a vivid account of the moral slough in which the Germans found themselves after their defeat. They were 'in a hopeless moral *cul-de-sac*.'

> 'For four years,' he writes, 'millions of German men had been licensed by their officers to indulge in vices of cruelty, bestiality, lust, cupidity, hate, and rapine at the expense of the vanquished, and on their return to civil life they behaved like men who had lost their moral sense.'

The pages in which he describes the outward manifestations of this widespread corruption of the soul make painful reading. In other countries there was a reflection, though a very pale one, of what happened in Germany. In England during the post-war years there was, at any rate in some circles, a definite slackening of moral standards.

Theological thinking was inevitably affected by such an environment. There was a quite understandable reaction towards the doctrine of man's total depravity. Faith in God's gift of human reason and human moral judgment was undermined. It is therefore not surprising that German theology developed along lines divergent from those of the older theology, a movement which has infected in greater or less measure some English theologians. Schweitzer had prepared the way by his stress on eschatology. An epoch of revolution, ruin, and tribulation, of blood and fire, when men's hearts fail them for fear, is congenial to apocalyptic ideas. In such times of distress, except to those who have a firmly grounded faith, any gradual growth of a divine Kingdom seems but a dream inconsistent with harsh and tragic reality. If men believe in God at all, he will be to them God the All-Terrible, the God of Judgment rather than the heavenly Father.

In England the great theologians who are in the Liberal tradition have stood firm against the impact of the theological tempest which reached its full force in Germany after World War No. 1. Their roots were set deep and strong. But in Germany it has been otherwise. In Germany, during the period of moral and spiritual

ollapse, man seemed a pitiful, contemptible creature, vainly truggling to find some kind of foothold in the general chaos, his rstwhile aspirations mocked by events. His position was desperte. Hence the wide acceptance of Karl Barth's 'Desperado heology.' The Barthians pointed the finger of scorn at the aspiraons of nineteenth-century Liberalism. Barth stigmatized all uman striving and aspiration as 'Titanism.' Man, throughout ne centuries, especially throughout the self-confident nineteenth entury, has been engaged in a futile attempt to build the Tower f Babel. In all this there is little enough of human pity or symathy. Rather is there a taunting note, a kind of theological *chadenfreude*, a word for which, happily, there is no exact Engsh equivalent.

The Jewish Apocalyptists looked for a spectacular irruption f God at the end of the present age. The Eschatological school nterpreted Jesus and his mission in the light of this expectation, hich, they held, was primary and central in his teaching. Barth inks up with the eschatologists in that he attaches no value to this orld of space and time. It is a derelict world, hollow, meaningess, banal. God belongs to another plane, one related to this lane of our temporal existence as the vertical to the horizontal. o use a characteristic phrase of Barth's, divine revelation comes, nd can only come, as 'a vertical miracle.' Following Kierkegaard, e characterizes God as one who is 'wholly other.' He is *Deus bsconditus*, the Hidden God. Man's actions, thoughts, and plans eing utterly futile, salvation can come from God alone. As Sidney ave has put it:

> 'The only light we have is the light given by Christ's death. And . . . that light appears, not as the light of the sun illuminating all things by its radiance, but rather as a streak of lightning, flashing out from the darkness of a stormy sky.'

here we have, admirably expressed, an indication of the apocayptic element in Barthianism.

That Barthianism is diametrically opposed to the broad tradion of Anglican theology is illustrated by some words of Dr. ashdall.

> 'That man is not merely the creature and plaything of God, that there is a certain community of nature between God and man, that all human minds are reproductions "in limited modes" (to use the expression of my old master, T. H. Green) of the Divine Mind, that in all human thinking there is a reproduction of the Divine thought, and above all that in the highest ideals which the human conscience recognizes there is a revelation of the ideal eternally present in the Divine Mind—these are the presuppositions under which alone any real meaning can be given to the doctrine [of the Incarnation].'

Not one of these presuppositions but would be violently repudiated by Barth. For him there is no kind of community of nature between God and man. In no sense, 'in limited modes' or otherwise, are human minds reproductions of the Divine Mind. Nor have human ideals, however lofty, any connexion with the ideal eternally present in the Divine Mind. He means it when he says that God is 'wholly other.' He uses the words in their most rigorous sense.

Obviously, if Rashdall is right, there must be something radically wrong with the Barthian doctrine of the Incarnation. Professor Raven has no doubt that there is. He says bluntly that the most evident heresy of the Barthians is probably in Christology, where they are explicitly Apollinarian, and for Apollinarius' own reason. We may add that Barth betrays no interest in the human Jesus save as a vehicle for the divine action. Jesus is for him simply 'the great *Incognito*.'

Karl Barth was born in 1886. Between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three he studied theology in the universities of Berlin, Tübingen and Marburg. He then took up pastoral work in Geneva, and while there his practical experience as a minister awakened in him a growing dissatisfaction with Liberal theology. Though Barth had behind him all the resources of massive scholarship, it is broadly true to say that Barthianism was born rather of the pulpit than of the study. Nor has he ever lost the style and temperament of the pulpiteer. From Geneva, in the next stage of his career, he moved back to Germany, where he was appointed Professor of Evangelical Theology in Bonn University. He published his first great work, the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, in 1918; but between 1918 and 1921, when a second edition appeared, so significant a development took place in his theological thinking that in the preface he could say that, as compared with the first edition, now 'not one stone, so to speak, is left upon another.' Thus it may be said that Barthianism came into being between 1918 and 1921. It was the theological aftermath of a world-shattering war, and is to be understood as such. The period of its gestation is highly significant.

The immediate impact of Barthianism on English theology was not obvious. Until Barth's writings began to be translated into English, English readers were repelled by the difficulties of a style at once rhetorical and complex. When his influence began to touch us many theologians attempted to acclimatize Barthianism and to co-ordinate it with English theology. Barth himself would be the first to pour scorn on any such enterprise. He has no liking for compromise, and his power of invective is considerable.

An anonymous contributor to *The Church Times*, writing in 1931, hit the nail on the head in the course of a description of a visit to Barth's lecture room. Though the lecture was delivered at the early hour of 7.15 a.m., he found an audience of over three hundred students gathered together to hear the great man. The writer describes Barth's method of lecturing thus:

> 'He did not reason with his hearers. He conveyed the impression that he was handing out goods. He lectured largely with his arms, and perhaps a cartoonist might successfully picture him as a workman handing a pile of bricks from a lorry to his mate. At any rate, such a picture would correctly portray the method of the Barthian school. It is a "hand out" theology, and this theology must either be accepted whole like a brick or else dropped.'

This judgment goes to the heart of the matter. It is vain to plead that half a brick is better than no bread. To change the metaphor, those English theologians who seek to concoct a mixture of Barth and water are attempting the impossible. Barth would be the first to insist that you take him neat or not at all, and Barth has a very clear conception of what his own doctrine involves.

No doubt under the conditions which will follow World War No. 2, with the ensuing distress of nations and the inevitable falsification by events of ardent hopes confidently cherished, Barthianism will continue to attract many of the desperate and disillusioned. It is therefore natural to look backwards and enquire what effect Barthianism had in fact on Germany, where, during the inter-war period, it exerted its most powerful and direct influence. The Confessional Church was thoroughly Barthian in theology, outlook and temper. Barth himself provides an answer. In effect he tells us that it failed.

> 'Christendom . . .,' he says, 'did not shine out with such clarity that people in Germany might have had to feel ashamed of having become guilty of so stupid, so complete a fall as has to-day become a reality there.'

But this is not good enough. It is too superficial. So far as Adolf Hitler would permit, Confessional Christianity kept aloof from the distractions and perplexities of a derelict world while passively awaiting the vertical miracle from on high. That is why it failed. Barth has in practice moved far from his earlier passive position; but he does not seem prepared to abandon it in principle.

Karl Barth poured scorn on the pretensions of human reason and human ideals. Rudolf Otto reinforced the tendency to deprecate the rational by stressing the instinctive and emotional. His book, *The Idea of the Holy*, was translated into English in 1923, and it was not long before his conception of the 'numinous' gained an increasing vogue in popular English theology. The essence of religion, certainly its root, was found in the shuddering sense of

awe, of dread of the eerie, which the savage experiences in face of the mystery of swamp and untrodden forest. From this ultimately developed, according to Otto, the sublime consciousness of the Holy which permeated the great prophets. All such emotion, from the crude fears of the savage to the lofty reverence of intense and refined religious consciousness, Otto comprehended under the one general term, awareness of 'the numinous.'

The religious thought of Otto was not unconnected with the tendencies of secular thought. In England, the gifted novelist D. H. Lawrence, before and during World War No. 1, had preached his gospel that we approach reality not by thinking but by feeling. He attached more importance to the entrails than to the brain. Later Hitler proclaimed the same doctrine with Teutonic fury when he exhorted all good Germans to think with the blood. In principle there is little difference between thinking with the blood and thinking with the entrails. Alike they imply the abandonment of any rational criterion of judgment. To this extent Lawrence, Hitler and Otto are in the same boat. Otto, it is true, sought to make his doctrine intellectually respectable by claiming to add the numinous to the Kantian categories of thought, but this attempt at camouflage does not really hide the real character of his doctrine which involves the exaltation of feeling to the primary position. He finds the origin of religion in the sense of the uncanny, the spooky, the weird, and in doing so he divorces religion from reason. B. H. Streeter charges him with the same kind of error as that of which Frazer was guilty when he confused Magic and Religion. No doubt religion had its roots in oozy slime, but its history is one of liberation from alien and lower elements. The sense of the Holy of an Isaiah, has nothing to do with the savage's fear of ghosts. However, it may be that Otto did something of religious value in that he reminded students, if such a reminder be necessary, that religion is a something more than a matter of the bare intellect.

Another important strand in the development of theological research during the past forty years has been the emergence of Form Criticism. The publication in 1919 of a German book by K. L. Schmidt, *The Framework of the History of Jesus*, was a critical landmark. The Form Critics attempt to get back behind Mark and *Q* and other written sources which may be disentangled by literary analysis to the 'forms' in which sayings and deeds of Jesus were transmitted orally. They assume that sayings of Jesus attached to appropriate settings appeared as isolated units, and that these units were committed to writing before they were embodied in our canonical Gospels. The scene for this process is

provided by the gatherings of early Christians for worship, instruction, and edification. The Gospels, even *Mark*, are for the most part but a collection of such units strung together as beads are strung on a thread. The detection and classification of these units is naturally highly speculative, and there are vast differences between the results reached by students who pursue the methods of Form Criticism. The Form Critics make one common assumption. The elusive units took shape in the religious meetings of primitive believers. But of primitive worship we know very little indeed. The hints we gather from the Pauline Epistles and from *Acts* hardly suggest that in those formative days anecdotes about Jesus, his acts and his teaching, played a conspicuous part. Indeed Goguel says bluntly that the Form Critics are trying to explain something of which we know little by something of which we know nothing at all. It is then not surprising that the Form Critics reach widely divergent conclusions. Some are drastically negative, others almost conservative. Professor R. H. Lightfoot in his Bampton Lectures *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, delivered in 1934 and published in 1935, ends with a passage singularly reminiscent of the closing passage of Schweitzer's great book and negative to the point of scepticism.

> 'It seems then that the form of the earthly no less than that of the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. For all the inestimable value of the gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of his voice, we trace in them but the outskirts of his ways.'

Whatever be our judgment of the very diverse conclusions reached by the Form Critics, they have served truth by driving home the important fact, which perhaps the literary critic was in some danger of forgetting, that behind our written Gospels lies a period of some thirty years of oral tradition for which we must make some kind of allowance.

So the process of thesis, antithesis, and at long last some kind of synthesis, goes on. The line of development at times seems tortuous to the contemporary observer. It may even appear to turn back on itself. Nevertheless the pursuit of truth is never fruitless. We may even venture, from our retrospect over the immediate past and some consideration of present tendencies, to make a tentative forecast as to the future line of theological thought.

THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

By the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, Editor of *The Church and the Twentieth Century*.

HE is a bold man who would claim to be able to pierce the mists which obscure the future development of theological thought. The past is strewn with the debris of unfulfilled prediction. When *Lux Mundi* appeared it inspired in Canon Liddon a dismayed foreboding. To him Gore seemed to have capitulated 'at the feet of the young Rationalist Professors,' and to have conceded to the enemy 'the main positions which the old Apologists of Holy Scripture have maintained.' Yet Gore was no revolutionary; he was a constructive bridge-builder. He built the bridge across which Anglican theology advanced into the twentieth century. The future revealed developments which Canon Liddon could not even surmise. When Benson was translated from Truro to Canterbury the great divine, F. J. A. Hort, wrote to him deploring the danger which threatened the future of the Church of England because of 'its calm and unobtrusive alienation in thought and spirit from the great silent multitude of Englishmen and again of alienation from fact and love of fact, mutual alienations both.' That Hort possessed greater powers of insight into the situation of the Church than Liddon is suggested by the recently published Church Assembly Report, *Towards the Conversion of England*, which acknowledges the alienation of the people from the Church. A divine of our own day, Dr. E. G. Selwyn, Dean of Winchester, has deplored the growing alienation of the Church from the world of culture.

> 'The serving of tables,' he says, 'has pushed itself to the fore with increasing pertinacity as the Church's most urgent need; and the sensitive links of understanding and sympathy which the Church enjoyed a generation ago with men of thought and reading in every walk of life, owing to the fact that the bishops and clergy themselves contributed so much first-class work in these fields, have now worn sadly thin.'

We are grateful that the Dean himself has notably strengthened the weakening links by the publication of his great commentary on the *First Epistle of St. Peter*. Though we may agree with him, as with his great predecessor F. J. A. Hort, that there is much in the Church's situation which is most disquieting, fears have many times been belied by events.

> 'If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars.'

The future of theology depends on the maintenance of stern

single-mindedness in the search for truth, and, as Hort would remind us, in an unclouded regard for factual truth. This is the primary requisite in an age of propaganda and ideologies.

But, though the future may be uncertain, it is permissible to try to discover some pointers which may prove to be significant of the shape of things to come. It is said that Professor C. H. Dodd and Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr have so strong an influence on some of the younger generation to whom, for good or evil, the future belongs that their disciples have inscribed on their banner the loyal motto, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy Dodd with all thy heart and thy Niebuhr as thyself.* Both of these theologians come trailing clouds of Barthianism behind them. Whether the clouds be considered clouds of glory or of murk depends on one's evaluation of Barthianism. Probably the future of the Barthian type of theology is bound up with the course of secular history. It is theological authoritarianism, and finds a response from men who, despairing of social and political progress along liberal lines, are prepared to submit themselves to authoritarian control in the secular sphere. Barthianism responds to their mood and is congenial to it in the same manner as St. Augustine reflected the mood of an age when civilization was on the point of collapse before an advancing barbarian.

Professor Dodd is primarily a New Testament critic, and holds a high place in the world of New Testament scholarship. He makes use of the methods of Form Criticism but does so with judicious discrimination. An outstanding characteristic of Form Criticism is the disparity of the results obtained by different Form Critics. Some reach drastically negative results, some positive results. Professor Dodd reaches positive results. But, whatever be the merits or defects of the methods of Form Criticism, the general trend of thought of Professor Dodd and his followers may give some clue as to lines of theological thought which may be prolonged into the future. Obviously Professor Dodd's special field of study covers a portion of history, the history of the genesis and early development of the Christian faith. We notice in his treatment of history an affinity with Barthianism, though we also note differences. Dodd assuredly would not, with Barth, characterize the realm of history as wholly derelict. But there is a general resemblance between Professor Dodd's *Heilsgeschichte*—a word for which, he admits, there is no convenient equivalent in the English language—and Barth's *Urgeschichte*. *Urgeschichte* is a kind of super-history, related to history as the supernatural is to the natural. On analysis it appears to be an essentially abstract and metaphysical conception with no concrete content. Professor

Dodd's *Heilsgeschichte* is history conceived 'as a redemptive process.' We may call it sacred history as distinguished from secular history. He calls history, in the ordinary sense of the word, 'empiric.' Are then historians such as Stubbs, Creighton, or Trevelyan to be classified as empiricists? It sounds not a little absurd. *Heilsgeschichte* is, Professor Dodd tells us, 'history as a process of redemption and revelation.' Perhaps he would not dissent from a description of it as human history interpreted in the light of the Christian dogmatic 'plan of salvation.' If so, the danger of forcing historical fact into an artificial conformity with dogmatic theory leaps to the eye. It is a vice to which theologians are addicted, and its consequences have been deplorably injurious to the cause of religion.

Professor Dodd's sacred history or *Heilsgeschichte* stands within a mythical, symbolic framework, with the Creation and Fall at one end and an eschatological Judgment at the other. 'The story of the creation and fall,' writes Professor Dodd, 'is a symbolic summing-up of everything in secular or empirical history which is preparatory to the process of redemption and revelation.' This is all very well; but it ought to be remembered that until quite recent times, without making any distinction between sacred history and empirical or secular history, Christian believers regarded Creation and Fall as just plain straightforward unadjectival history. They assuredly regarded the Second Coming and the Final Judgment as future events on whose unknown date they might even speculate. That has been the traditional view throughout the centuries of the Christian era. We may, however, note that our Lord, so far as the records go, showed no interest in the myth of Creation and Fall, nor in the date of the Second Coming. There is no reason to suspect that they played any significant part in His thought. However, for Professor Dodd, as for Karl Barth, they are of primary importance.

To Barth's dualism between *Urgeschichte* and secular history corresponds, though perhaps somewhat toned down, Professor Dodd's dualism between *Heilsgeschichte* or 'sacred history' and what he calls the 'empiric' history of the historian: Professor Dodd rightly points out that no fact enters into any kind of history except by virtue of some significance or meaning attached to it, and that the task of the historian is not merely to record but to interpret facts. That is true enough. History is not a rag-bag of bare facts. But though fact and interpretation may not be divorced, this is all the more reason why the historian should ever be on his guard against confusing the two. Facts reach him through many and varied channels, and it is part of his duty to make full allowance

for the interpretations which have been or may have been placed on them in the course of their transmission. Especially cautious should be the practitioner of Form Criticism who, avowedly, uses as his raw material 'forms' of narration or teaching which are by their nature liable to be strongly coloured by a prior interpretative process. Even if we reach the most primitive interpretation of the facts with which the Gospels or Epistles concern themselves, we are then driven to enquire 'whether the primitive interpretation is the true, or the most probable, interpretation.' Otherwise we are landed in a pious-sounding scepticism, which is none the less scepticism because it is couched in religious phraseology. As Dr. Tennant points out, 'the impression implies subjective wax as well as objective seal.'

Professor Dodd surveys the history of Israel 'not under modern categories of development'; he sees it as a series of 'crises' in which 'the word of God descends upon history through Abraham, Moses and the prophets.' He omits to state the grounds on which the student may legitimately assign to this or that pronouncement, or this or that event, the status of a word of God. This is a fundamental defect which he shares with Barth, whose phraseology he borrows when he says that 'the horizontal line of the secular process is cut vertically by the word of God from on high.' Yet he is bound to admit that in fact we can trace some kind of development in Old Testament theology.

> 'There is enough continuity,' he says, 'between the various stages to warrant the use of the organic concept of development, and the end of the process is richer, finer, truer than the beginning, if such terms have any meaning for the historian.'

But why, one is driven to ask, should not the historian have a conception of what is rich and fine and true at least as sensitive as that of any Barthian or semi-Barthian theologian? At any rate he may claim to possess and exercise the criteria of reason and the moral consciousness.

Dr. Niebuhr, the second theologian who is reputed to have a wide influence on the rising generation, has embodied his system of thought in the two volumes of his Gifford Lectures published under the title of *The Nature and Destiny of Man*. Here again we find a dualism as emphatic as that between Professor Dodd's *Heilsgeschichte* and secular or empiric history. It is the dualism between Nature and Grace. He also sets in sharp antithesis the Christian interpretation of history and the interpretation of history by various schools of philosophical thought from Plato to Hegel and Marx. Another antithesis is that between Hebraism and Hellenism. The influence of Barth is not so direct and marked as

in the case of Professor Dodd; but it is there in spite of the fact that Dr. Niebuhr can and does criticize Barth sharply and often acutely. Professor Raven speaks of Niebuhr's 'real passion and sincerity,' and it may be that it is these admirable qualities which win for him the devotion of his younger disciples. He covers a field so extensive that none but the very widely-read professional scholar may venture to appraise all his conclusions in detail. Professor Raven, who is ungrudging in his admiration for Dr. Niebuhr's brilliant gifts, says of his Gifford Lectures that they are 'brilliant in their rhetoric, but often misleading in their generalizations.' Commenting on the sharp antithesis he makes between Greek and Jew, Professor Raven bluntly says, 'I, scrutinizing his treatment of Hellenism, conclude from his many misstatements and loose generalizations that he really knows very little about it.' Possibly some of his more ardent disciples know even less. His affinity with Barthianism is illustrated by his addiction to paradox, a characteristic inherited by Karl Barth from his spiritual progenitor, Kierkegaard. However, for Dr. Niebuhr, what is sauce for the goose is emphatically *not* sauce for the gander, for what in his own case is a splendid and profound paradox, is in the case of anyone with whom he is not in agreement a pitiable failure in logic. Professor Raven deplores 'his habit of dismissing what he dislikes on the ground of its illogicality and defending his own preferences on precisely the same ground.' 'To be paradoxical is for him a virtue in Kierkegaard but a vice in Spinoza.' He is profuse in references to theologians and philosophers of all ages, but, though his Gifford Lectures are largely concerned with the subject of divine grace, only once does he refer, and that in a footnote, to that great theological classic, Oman's *Grace and Personality*. It is an omission no less significant than strange.

An examination of the teaching of Professor Dodd and Dr. Niebuhr is germane to a consideration of possible future theological development because of their influence on the younger men. They are both influenced by Barth's doctrine and method. Does this mean that we have to reckon on the presence in English theological thought in the future of a kind of naturalized Barthianism, or, at any rate, as in the case of Dr. Niebuhr, are we even now witnessing a gradual retreat from Barthianism? Only the future can provide a clear answer. Conditions may favour the kind of authoritarianism which Barthianism provides. If we move into an epoch of cataclysms and distracting uncertainties, the tumult of tempest and earthquake may well, for a time, drown the sound of the still small voice of reason and the moral consciousness through which, in quieter times, men have ever heard the voice of God.

Paradox, however dazzling, is inimical to theology. It is, in truth, no virtue to maintain two inconsistent or contradictory propositions simultaneously. It may be tolerable so long as they are regarded as only *seemingly* contradictory or inconsistent and there is a conviction that the apparent discord is capable of resolution into a future harmony. To be content to rest in paradox is the suicide of theology.

Theology is secondary to religion, and religion is not exclusively nor even mainly a concern of the cloister or the study or the lecture hall. Theological development may in the long run be determined by the shape which religious faith takes in the years to come, and the faith which will be formative will be that of the intelligent sincere man who, unhappily, for various reasons does not always find himself welcome or at home in official ecclesiastical circles. It is refreshing to find such a man acting on a diocesan committee and writing to the lay press urging support for a diocesan appeal for £600,000. He seeks to enlist the sympathy of 'every man and woman who believes that a world without God is a world without meaning.' He writes :

> 'I do not at all question that it is possible as a secularist to maintain the highest standard of private and public conduct. I have no sort of doubt that men and women of that rare type are serving their generation and fulfilling God's purpose. But, generally speaking, if we are not aware of any divine purpose, if nothing apart from the importance of worldly success has ever been brought to our notice, we shall fight for our own hands, for ease and comfort, during the tiny period in which, in the soulless and purposeless infinity, we mean anything at all.'

As to theological dogma, he writes :

> 'Dogma, the attempt of the finite to codify the infinite, does not appear to me to matter.'

Here he expresses the attitude of a great body of sincere men whose religious faith is indisputable. We rejoice that he is playing a full and active part in the life of the diocese to which he belongs. Many others are repelled by the whole ecclesiastical atmosphere and stand aloof. If the theologians attempt to confine the thoughtful religious man in an intellectual strait-waistcoat, it will be so much the worse for theology. Religious faith will take forms at which we now cannot even guess; theology will dwindle into the concern of a diminishing clique of specialists; church attendance will become even sparser; and the churches will move still further along the road of sectarianism.

Another layman, the late J. A. Spender, a man of wide culture, who in the days when he edited the *Westminster Gazette* exerted a profound influence on men and affairs, was a sincerely religious man. Readers of his biography by W. Wilson Harris will remember

its moving account of his affirmation of faith when the end was approaching. Yet he was far from at home in the church of the theologians. Will the theology of the future give a sufficiently free expression to the faith of such a man? Will it in fact be the theology of the future or the theology of the past brought up to date by ingenious contrivance and timid adjustment? Spender, at one time, used to read the Lessons in his parish church. His biographer does not say what knowledge, if any, he had of biblical criticism, but he lets Spender speak for himself. This is what he says:

> 'Reading the Gospels aloud does, in an extraordinary way, bring home their beauty and simplicity, their sudden plunges into the mysterious and the profound, the unexpected and the paradoxical. But it also throws into the background all the accretions from Pauline legalism, Greek Neo-Platonism, Oriental mystery cults, which have turned them into a theology. The figure of Jesus becomes the absorbing interest. One sees Him more and more as the supreme example for the Western world of a life lived according to the Spirit, and one seeks hungrily for the least fragment of His authentic words, whether in the variants of the Gospel manuscripts, or in the logia of the Oxyrhynchus papyri. . . . Indeed, I am no one, but when churchmen themselves ask why churches are empty and why religion, as they understand it, has lost its hold on reasonably intelligent people who are, nevertheless, seeking for a religion, I am entitled to bear my witness. This is, briefly, that while I believe fervently in the religion of the Spirit, I cannot accept formulas and doctrines fetched from ancient and mediaeval times which seem to me to despiritualize Him and to perpetuate a conception of God which, though natural in its historical setting, cannot be reconciled with what we now know of the physical universe.'

The biblical scholar may find much to criticize from his own standpoint in all this. He may, for instance, say that Spender has underestimated the theological factor in the Gospel presentation of Jesus. So be it. But if the scholar sees here nothing but material for his critical acumen and fails to perceive the intense faith which shines through Spender's words, he is clearly afflicted with spiritual myopia and has missed the essential significance of the passage. The theology of the future will be an arid anachronism unless it be broad enough to express the faith of cultured men such as Spender without imposing on them a sense of arbitrary mental constriction.

But Spender may have something of value to say to the expert in Biblical criticism even in his own field. He was a man of wide culture and of delicate sensibility. It is therefore not unreasonable to pay regard to the impression made on him by the Jesus of the Gospels. The radical Form Critic tells us that the Gospels 'yield us little more than a whisper of His voice.' What Spender heard, or thought he heard, was something louder and clearer than a whisper. It may be that he was right, and that his judgment of what he can hear is more reliable than that of the specialist scholar.

That the methods of Form Criticism may be supplemented or even superseded is suggested by W. L. Knox's fresh and vigorous Schweich Lectures delivered in 1942 and published in 1944 under the title *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*. This book may be a significant pointer towards future developments in method. He approaches the examination of the Gospel narrations by way of the linguistic style of the various sections. For instance, he says of the story of the raising of the widow's son at Nain that, though St. Luke could write quite good Greek when he chose, this narrative is couched in 'a typical bit of bad translation Greek, even worse than the average,' and, whether it be true or not, he therefore allots it to a Palestinian tradition. The linguistic expert must assess the value of his conclusions. His method is free from the element of surmise and imaginative subjectivism which is inherent in Form Criticism which from inadequate material constructs a hypothetical picture of primitive worship and teaching and then proceeds to force the elements which make up the Synoptic narrative into this picture. It is not surprising that the practitioners of Form Criticism reach widely disparate results. Canon Knox's methods are stimulating, his results suggestive. The ground he has broken may be profitably tilled by other scholars.

J. A. Spender speaks of theological 'accretions.' That there have been multitudinous accretions is beyond question; but it is important to distinguish between accretion and development. If you set yourself to propagate a faith you are bound of necessity to express it in terms comprehensible to your hearers; you must use their thought-forms. Unless you do this you are wasting your breath; you are talking to them in a tongue foreign to them. No 'vertical' Barthian miracle of revelation will solve your dilemma. The Jewish proselytizers experienced this necessity when they sought to commend the Jewish faith to a Gentile world. In their presentation of it they drew freely on what Canon Knox describes as 'the popular philosophy that was the common property of all intelligent people who were not Epicureans or Sceptics.' We know a good deal about their technique from the writings of Philo of Alexandria, who compiled a heterogeneous mass of material, by no means wholly self-consistent, which was serviceable in the propagation of Jewish religion among the Gentiles. The author of the Fourth Gospel adopted the same technique in presenting the Christian faith to Gentile readers. He was, for instance, borrowing from current Jewish apologetic when he presented Jesus to the Gentile world as the Logos. This process was one of development rather than of accretion.

Spender was an admirable representative of the best type of

cultured, earnest, spiritually-minded layman of our day. He said that he longed for a theology which could be reconciled with what we know of the physical universe. But we need a good deal more than that. The task of the theologian of the future is similar to that of the Fourth Evangelist when he essayed to present the Gospel in terms congenial to the ways of contemporary thinking. It is not an easy task. It will require the service of men who are cultured humanists as well as technical theologians. The crass and blatant cross-heading in the Report, *Towards the Conversion of England*, 'Humanism the Age-long Lie,' is nothing less than a 'No Thoroughfare' notice across the path of advance of the theology which is to be.

The task of the theologian is comparable to that brilliantly achieved by the mediaeval Schoolmen who set themselves to express the Faith in terms of the new knowledge and thought which illuminated men's minds as they emerged from the gloom of the Dark Ages. Dean Rashdall said of Aquinas, the prince among Schoolmen,

> 'The *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas is the most splendid attempt which has ever been made to build up a Christian Philosophy of the Universe, to reconcile Christianity with the highest Philosophy known at the time of its production, and to defend it with the weapons of Reason.'

During the Dark Ages the lamp of culture had, in Western Europe, flickered low to the point of extinction. Such theology as there was in the main presupposed the philosophy of Neo-Platonism and was based on the Fathers, especially on St. Augustine. Most of the writings of Aristotle had been lost, though a portion of his *Organon* survived and was used as a text-book of Logic. Such was the position from the sixth to the twelfth century. But the flame which flickered feebly in the West began to shine brilliantly in the East. Persecuted Nestorians had fled to Bagdad carrying with them much of the learning which had been lost to Europe, and by the tenth century Bagdad was an outstanding centre of thought and culture. The writings of ancient Europe were translated into Arabic and studied with avidity. This Arabic culture was carried forward with the on-surge of Moslem conquest sweeping across North Africa and eventually reaching Spain. Much of the ancient learning was recovered to Europe through the medium of translation into Latin of Arabic writings which, in their turn, were translations of Greek philosophical classics. A great deal of this work of translation, whether from Arabic or from the original Greek writings direct, was done at Toledo, where there was a regular college of translators.

It was under the influence of this revival of learning that Scholasticism came into being. It had no smooth passage as it developed through the adventurous speculations of Anselm, Abelard, Peter Lombard, up to Thomas Aquinas. Abelard was the object of bitter persecution, his arch-enemy being St. Bernard. But his successor, Peter Lombard, whose teaching was substantially the same as Abelard's, won such acceptance that his *Sentences* came to be used as a standard text-book.

We may venerate the great Schoolmen for their adventurous devotion to truth; we may admire their intellectual honesty and courage; but any attempt to elude the tasks and problems of to-day and to-morrow by seeking a theological refuge in the system they constructed is a perverted form of homage to their memory. It is nothing less than escapism. Theology is loyal to their spirit only if it sets itself to accomplish for its own age the task which they accomplished for theirs.

The task of the theology of the future is more complicated than that which confronted the Schoolmen. For various reasons Scholasticism declined, and, concurrently, the new culture of the Renascence came to birth. Scholasticism continued to exert a notable backward pull. Calvin, for instance, continued to think as a Schoolman, and eventually mediaeval Scholasticism was officially established as the basis of Roman Catholic theology. But the perennial problem of expressing the Christian Truth in terms of current knowledge and forms of thought has become much more complex. Nor has it lost its complexity for the modern man, who, whether he likes it or not, is a child of the Renascence. You can't change your ancestry, and attempts to put back the clock are futile. The New Learning took divers forms, and it brought with it no unifying philosophy comparable to Aristotelianism. The dominating authority which the Church had possessed in earlier days had been dissolved. Centrifugal tendencies were strong and there was considerable fragmentation.

One of the sequels of the Renascence was the development of the natural sciences. It is notorious that theology had difficulty in accommodating itself to this department of new knowledge. Some theologians have tried to stay the advancing flood, and not a few have made themselves not a little ridiculous by their attempts. But to-day, at any rate in the Church of England, it would be difficult to name any reputable theologian who frankly adopts an obscurantist attitude towards scientific knowledge. Fundamentalism lurks only in those dark regions where men are too dull in mind to be affected by the culture of their age. J. A. Spender revolted against formulas and doctrines which seemed to him 'to perpetuate a

conception of God which, though natural in its historical setting, cannot be reconciled with what we know of the physical universe.' Perhaps he underestimated the extent to which rational theologians have effected the desired reconciliation. But, in itself, his demand is reasonable. It does not, however, go far enough. As a child of his own age the theologian must enter into the mind of the scientist, think his thoughts, and adopt his methods of approach. Only so can he hope to commend the Faith to the scientist, and not only to him, but also to the countless body of uninformed camp-followers who, themselves ignorant of science and untrained in scientific method, nevertheless uncritically accept the scientist as their leader. The faith of the theologian in the unity of truth should inspire him in this adventure. Truth in all its aspects and departments must be sacred to him. Nor will he be dismayed by difficulties nor be content to rest in insoluble paradoxes. It is his faith that all truth is of God which forbids him to despair when, to his limited vision, honest seekers after truth seem to be moving in divergent directions. He needs to combine humility and patience with courage and determination.

It may be that in time to come theologians will look back on Dr. F. R. Tennant's *Philosophical Theology* as a formative influence. Dr. Tennant is not only a theologian; he is also a Bachelor of Science and a Fellow of the British Academy. He understands the purpose and method of the historian, whom he certainly would not dismiss as a mere empiricist. He needs no effort to enter into the mind of the natural scientist, for he has the scientific mind. He approaches the problems of theology along lines which should be congenial and natural to the scientific thinker. The reader who does not care to face the difficulties of his *magnum opus* will find a shorter and more popular exposition of his line of thinking in his smaller books, *Philosophy of the Sciences* and *The Nature of Belief*. Dr. Tennant holds that the method of induction, which is essentially the method of the scientist, involves an element of faith, faith that the universe is rational, that it is not, as conceivably it might be, a chaos. Though this faith is incapable of rigid logical proof, it is reasonable and it has borne and bears fruit. The world moreover responds not only to exploration by reason, but also to the moral approach, inasmuch as experience shows it to be, in Keats' pregnant phrase, 'a vale of soul-making.' It also very definitely responds to man's aesthetic judgment. Though such considerations do not provide strict logical proof that the world is the creation of a God of reason, goodness and beauty, they do provide a reasonable ground for faith in such a God, a faith every bit as reasonable as that of the natural scientist. Dr. Tennant forsakes

the well-trodden *a priori* road of the Schoolmen and leads his readers by a path along which the man of our age of science may follow him without doing violence to his way of thinking. It is of primary importance that the religious thinker should take such a path.

There are signs that the vogue of transcendental authoritarianism is passing. A recent scholarly book by Dr. T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent*, is a valuable counteractive to the eschatological obsession which has accompanied it. Useful work is being done in clearing away obstacles to further advance, and doubtless much remains to be done. If truth be fundamentally one, the Christian theologian will regard every honest seeker after truth, in whatever direction his search leads him, as a brother. In the faith that all truth is of God and that, in whatever guise it come, truth is to be reverenced, the theologian will enter the unknown future with confidence but without arrogance, undismayed by the perplexities which seem to beset its portals.

A GREAT CHRISTIAN WORD

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE CHAPEL OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

By the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D.

'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'
—*I John* v, 4.

THE late Master of Jesus, Arthur Gray, a few years before the recent war told me the following story. He had had in college a Japanese undergraduate whose elder brother had but lately gone down, and the elder had written to the younger a letter of friendly advice, urging him to make the most of his time in Europe, both in term and vacation. Travel, he said, and take note of what you see. From the Germans you will learn method, from the British you will learn character, from the French however I do not think you will learn anything. Of course one can accept no responsibility for this judgment of a young Asiatic, and he was obviously most unfair to France, but his comment on ourselves gives one much food for thought. In part he was no doubt referring to our individualism, in contrast with the communal spirit of the Japanese, who, with their Buddhist background, have not a strong sense of the value of the individual, and so (equally) not a strong

sense of the importance of individual personality; but he seems to have had in mind something deeper than that, namely, that most British people, with many centuries of Christian training behind them, exhibit a character based on that which is spoken of in my text, namely, a living faith of a particular sort. They may not think about it, or be conscious of it, and they may even be living on their spiritual reserves. But those reserves are there, and they colour the life of the nation and of the individual, with all its faults and apostasies. Hence the recent saying of a visitor to this country, that he saw here a new thing, a country as never before in history so anxious to do what was right that it failed to consider its own interests and convenience. In respect of an individual, I hope to illustrate this by another true story, but that had better come later on.

Meanwhile, what right have I to speak to you of so august a subject as faith? One remembers the challenging words of Karl Barth: 'Who are you, you man up there in the pulpit, with God's word on your lips?' Well, no one, least of all the present preacher, can be worthy of such a task. But at any rate I can and do confess that whatever faith I have has not been gained or held without a struggle or without cost. I do not speak to you lightly or easily about it. I don't refer so much to actual intellectual difficulties, but rather to the thwartings, burdens, and discouragements of practical life. The most fastidious of modern metaphysical critics has said recently: 'It is impossible to *disprove* theism.' That may well be true, but it is possible for 'the fell clutch of circumstance' to hamstring belief. From my undergraduate days onwards I have had to take many a hard knock, indeed so many that one has almost been tempted at times to echo the cry of Francis Thompson:

> 'Ah—Designer Infinite—Ah, *must* Thou char the wood ere Thou canst limn with it?

But such petulance gets one nowhere. A better way is to follow Blake's advice:

> 'Joy and woe are woven fine
> A clothing for the soul, divine,
> Under every grief and pine runs a joy, with silken twine,
> It is well it should be so:
> Man was made for joy and woe:
> And when this we surely know,
> Safely through the world we go.'

But it is high time to leave poets and personalities and to come to grips with our main subject, *Faith* as a great Christian word.

Is it specifically Christian? Apparently not. We speak of the faith of a Moslem, or of the World Congress of Faiths (in the plural), and so on. We even say, I have faith in my doctor, or in my

lawyer, or, still more oddly, faith in my car to do a certain journey without breaking down. As so often in English, we use the same word to describe a number of totally different activities, and we must very carefully distinguish what is our present concern. Faith, one supposes, means primarily reliance upon a person or thing without *complete* evidence. It forges ahead of the actual facts and assumes the probability that things will happen or persons behave in a certain way. It is, in that sense, '*taking a chance*.' But of course the extent of the chance depends upon what is previously known. The less one knows, the more hazardous the experiment; and the nature of the chance depends upon whether the experiment of trusting is made in respect of a machine, or a human being, or God, and also how much previous experience lies behind it. Still, without experiment this business of living could not go on at all. A well-known American scholar once defined faith as 'not belief in spite of evidence but life in scorn of consequence.' Put in that rather slashing form it contains a false antithesis. But it is possible to say something like it which is certainly true, and that is that faith is belief which ranges (if not *extrapolates*) beyond the actual evidence, and is *therefore* life in scorn of consequence. In the sphere of religion this means trust, leading to long-term *experiment* touching that which is ultimate.

Now it is something of a misfortune that the same word faith should have been used to translate two such very different experimental religious acts as those of the Christian and the Buddhist. The Buddhist makes his confession of faith in the Buddha, in the Buddha's rule of life, and in the Buddhist community. But the *Pâli* word, I understand, means 'refuge' or 'retreat,' or 'resort to a teacher.' The experiment in this instance means, therefore, trying out the plan of what Albert Schweitzer has called world-and-life-negation. One tries taking refuge in a system, because the ordinary world seems unsatisfactory and evanescent. It is a *real* experiment, and the person who makes it goes beyond the actual evidence of reason and the senses, and takes a step into the unknown — but *away from* life, and only with a vague trust in the Absolute.

Faith in the Christian sense is equally experimental, but it is, where alien elements have not intruded themselves into it and warped it, an entirely different kind of experiment, an experiment in constructive adventure, not in finding a way of escape, and an adventure which is shared with and actually led by a Deity who is not sub-personal but super-personal. The standard case quoted in the Bible is always that of Abraham, who went forth, not knowing whither he was going, except that it was *in* the world, and that he

was going for a constructive reason. It is noticeable that the nearer Buddhism gets to Christianity, as in Japan, the less is it a retreat. The nearer Christianity approaches to Eastern pessimism, the less does it resemble an adventure.

I grant you that some of the most familiar Evangelical hymns, such as 'Rock of Ages' and 'Jesu, Lover of my soul,' seem to imply that faith means 'hiding oneself from the storms of life.' If that is what they really mean, then I am afraid that to that extent they are sub-Christian in sentiment. But I find a standard definition of the New Testament word for faith, *pistis*, is given as 'welcome conviction,' and we all know that Christ must have used a word in Aramaic which is rendered *pistis* in the Greek, and of that quality He said, speaking in his poet's way with characteristic hyperbole, that the possession of a *minute amount* of it (only as much as a grain of mustard-seed!) would enable one to remove a mountain and cast it into the sea. Not surprising that someone has called this 'atomic faith'!

I think this word that Jesus used must have been something like the earlier Hebrew word, *ĕmunnah*, which is not a common word in the Old Testament, and which is generally used there of the reliability of human persons. The Hebrew attitude towards God, as Lightfoot pointed out, was *fear rather than trust*. When the prophet Habakkuk says, 'The just shall live by his ĕmunnah,' he is probably using the word in the sense of 'faithfulness' or 'integrity,' but he *may* be taking a new step, and saying that the man of faith, from Abraham onwards, is the man who, living a just and fearless life 'in scorn of consequence,' does so because he believes (or at any rate makes the experimental assumption) that the Power behind phenomena is friendly to his highest ideals, and is to be *relied upon* to see that they are neither destroyed nor defeated. Habakkuk may not himself have meant the latter, but it is certain that this is how his message was interpreted by later generations of Jews, and it is certain that this is what Christ meant by faith, in the passage which has been read to-night for the second lesson.[1] It is certainly the demonstration of it which He gives in His life and sufferings. And, finally, it is this meaning which is found in the authentic utterances of early Christians — a victorious and world-transforming conviction, an experimental trust in God, leading them on to indomitable action, without counting the cost. And let us note that this word faith, or *pistis*, is used in Classical Greek with only the very slightest reference to religion. πιστὶς θεῶν is, I believe, rare. Clement of Alexandria says that the Greeks regarded

[1] *Matthew* xvii 20.

the act of *pistis* as futile and barbarous. Plato used the word as only meaning 'unverified opinion.' This seems to bear out what Dr. Glover once said, that God became an entirely different Being to the average European after Jesus had lived. The Greeks before Christ, like the Jews, had feared rather than trusted Deity.

I grant you freely all the miserable failures of organized Christianity, for if you organize and dilute anything beautiful and heroic you do so at grave risk, but I am not so sure that, human nature being what it is, some of that organization could have been avoided. Meanwhile let us hear what two or three Christians have had to say about faith.

St. Paul's letters contain much about it, but his twice-born soul was so greatly concerned with the need for rescue from wrath, judgment and damnation that he sometimes seems to limit the *value* of the 'welcome conviction' to 'acquittal from guilt.' Fortunately he knew that its implications were wider than that, as a study of his various uses of *pistis* seems to indicate, but we must always remember von Hügel's warning that, because St. Paul is the first great cataclysmic convert to Christianity from legalism, we need to take him *cum grano salis*. In *Romans* and *Galatians* he speaks of the *faith* of 'Abraham our father,' but there chiefly as securing acquittal better than a scrupulous observance of ritual and formulas. This, though true, is not enough by itself. St. Paul's (alleged) best picture is of the Christian warrior standing his ground and wearing God's own armour, including the shield of *pistis*, wherewith he is able to fend off all the flame-tipped arrows of the hosts of evil, Satan's *flammenwerfer*. Yet, curiously enough, just because this occurs in the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, it is doubtful whether it is actually Pauline.

The anonymous writer of *Hebrews* gives us his famous definition of *pistis* in ch. xi, as ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων and follows it with a noble portrait-gallery of faithful people, ranging from Abraham to Maccabees, 'who through faith wrought righteousness, stopped the mouths of lions,' and so on.

Then outside the Bible there is the fine utterance of Aphrahat, the Christian sage of Persian origin, who says:

> 'When a man shall believe in God the Lord of all
> That made the heavens and the earth and the seas and all that in them is,
> Who made man in His image
> Who gave the law to Moses
> Who sent of His spirit in the prophets
> Who sent His Messiah into the world;
> And that a man should believe in the bringing to life of the dead
> And believe also in the mystery of regeneration,
> This is the faith of the Church of God.

> And that a man should separate himself
> from observing hours and sabbaths and months and seasons
> and enchantments and divinations and astrology and magic,
> and from fornication and revelling and from vain doctrines,
> the weapons of the Evil One, and from the
> blandishment of honeyed words, and from blasphemy and from adultery,
> And that no man should bear false witness,
> And that none should speak with double tongues :
> These are the works of the Faith that is laid on the true Rock, the Messiah,
> upon whom all the building doth arise.'

That is Burkitt's own rendering of the Syriac, and he adds :

> 'Faith to Aphrahat is not a tissue of philosophical speculations, but the revelation of a Divine Spirit dwelling in man and fighting against moral evil.'

So great a unity is there about religious experience that one remembers that Zarathustra got very near to the same belief in the same country a good many centuries earlier.

And now let us hear the homely utterances of a modern Christian, an Irish army chaplain, whose name was familiar twenty years ago, Studdert Kennedy. 'Faith,' he says, 'is betting your life and the ould shirrt on y'r back that there's a God and that His character is that of Jesus Christ.' This at any rate is not academic (it is a colloquial form of the old definition of faith as 'living by the noblest hypothesis'), but it says much the same as the Persian sage, and much the same as the words of my text, and it is the guiding principle of many practising even though inarticulate Christians, who would be hard put to it to express their belief in any form, literary or otherwise, but who are the backbone of the community in which they live, and many of whom it has been my honour and privilege to know and worship with during a ministry of thirty-eight years.

What one notices about such people is their dependence upon an *invisible* and *imponderable factor* which makes them do adventurous and world-transforming things of which we can hardly bear to speak without emotion, and without feeling impertinent. An invisible factor. Yes. We know very well that if we had ourselves been able to be present upon Calvary we should have found the evidence of our senses conflicting. We should have *seen* an *execution*, though from the words and demeanour of the victim we might have drawn the conclusion that it was no ordinary execution. We might have come away saying, with the centurion,[2] 'Truly

[2] Did the centurion mean to imply : 'Caesar is styled· υἱος θεοῦ : it is in fact the correct formula for a royal personage. But this man we have seen die really is royal'?

this man was υἱὸς θεοῦ' — Divine — if you like, 'the Timeless, discontinuously present in the historical.' Or we might have said the same bitter words as some of the Jews, 'that deceiver.' Or we might have come to the same conclusion as D. H. Lawrence, reading the story after the lapse of centuries, 'Jesus trusted in God, and God let Him down.' The Christian takes the chance that it was the centurion who judged the situation *rightly*, and he finds the experiment fruitful as no other. His 'welcome conviction' is of the integrity and utter dependableness of the God in Whom he believes, so that he is able to attempt great things for Him, and to take unlimited hazards. He is 'persuaded' that he can and should 'trust God, see all, nor be afraid,' and that we are 'more than conquerors through Him who hath loved us'; and he endures, 'as seeing Him who is invisible'—the Alpha and Omega, who holds in His hand the keys of the future.

I have, alas, no time to give you examples from my own experiences as a padre, but you must believe me when I say that I could supply many, and that they all tell us something very noteworthy about the Cosmic Process, of which we are part. It appears that that Process throws up certain creatures some of whom, under stimulus, act in this way, and always fruitfully. To me still the most natural explanation is that the ordinary Christian claim is correct (as embodied in my text), and that the Christian faith in its basic form is still, as St. Augustine the Great said somewhere in his *Retractations*,[3] the real natural religion of humanity. Certainly the possessor of Christian faith is not only supremely at home in this dangerous universe, but supremely able to cope with the task of making this temporary world-home of ours as heavenly as possible. Any alternative proposal raises more difficulties than it solves, and ends by landing one in a worse position than before one started.

Trust in God as the Wise Parent, trust in His Revelation of His Character in action, trust in the power of His Love to convert the wayward, trust in His generosity to forgive the erring—all this is faith of the richest order. Yet it can only be justified by long-term experiment. No amount of talking can communicate its truth to others. The evidence of reason is insufficient to establish more than the *probability* of our belief. Life alone can demonstrate its victorious quality.

There are just three more points needed to complete this synopsis of the Bible picture. First, the quality of faith is a gift of the Holy Spirit. This means that since from God all holy desires,

[3] *Retr.* i, 13.

good counsels, and just works proceed, the instinct which we can by God's grace use and develop if we will, comes from God as part of our natural endowment, and we can never rightly take any credit for it. *Merit* is excluded. Second, St. Paul very properly warns us that faith, unless it is combined with love, is 'as nought.' Third, St. James, when using faith in the sense of assent to a creed ('thou believest that God is one') rightly reminds us that with the Christian there must be a total union of theory and practice. Intellectual assent is barren unless at the same time one is ready to 'hazard all for God at a clap.'

And now let us get back to where we started, and hear with bated breath the true story of how an Englishman lately showed to some Japanese what is meant by a living faith.

The man's name was Alfred Sadd, and he was a worker for the London Missionary Society on the Pacific Island of Tarawa. After Pearl Harbour his society sent a ship to take him away to safety, but he refused to avail himself of the offer and stayed behind to look after his flock. The sequel has been told by Godfrey Winn of the B.B.C. in 'Scrap-book of Victory.'

> 'When the Americans landed on Tarawa they heard the story of his final devotion to duty from natives, who described the last scene in words that reminded me irresistibly of one of the great messenger choruses from a play of Sophocles. Here it is. Sadd was lined up with twenty other men, mostly New Zealand soldiers. The Japanese then placed a Union Jack on the ground, and directed Sadd to walk across it. "Mr. Sadd approached the flag and then turned to the right. They made him start again: this time he turned to the left. The third time he was compelled to go up to the flag; he gathered it in his arms and kissed it. When the Japanese took Mr. Sadd and the others out to be shot, many were so young they were very heavy-hearted, but Mr. Sadd cheered them up. While they were waiting to be shot, Mr. Sadd stepped out in front of the line and encouraged them. When he had done, he took up a position a little in front of the line so that he should be the first to die. And he died first."'

The only fitting comment that can be made on this story is surely contained in the words of the New Testament:

> 'Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every encumbrance and the sin which doth so closely cling to us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the Pioneer and Perfecter of the *faith* which should be *ours*, who for the joy that was set before *Him* endured the gallows, despising its shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.'

THE TESTAMENT OF H. G. WELLS

By Gamaliel Milner, M.A., author of *The Problem of Decadence*.

> 'A man so various that he seemed to be
> Not one but all mankind's epitome.'

So wrote Dryden of Zimri, *videlicet* the Duke of Buckingham. He added unkindly:

> 'Stiff in opinion, always in the wrong,
> Was everything by starts and nothing long.'

The literary colossus who bestrode the eighteenth century, epic poet, dramatist, historian, philosopher, scientist, wit, and polemical writer, friend of monarchs and prince of philanthropists, was called the Universal M. de Voltaire. His name survives as the representative of an epoch, the embodiment of a mood; his writings for the most part are unread. Versatility makes for temporary notoriety rather than for permanent fame. One thing perfectly done counts for more with posterity than a thousand things imperfectly attained.

Whatever the intrinsic merits of Mr. Wells as a writer or thinker, his works will be a mine of information for the historian of the end of the Victorian Age. He was forty-seven, already world-famous, on the fatal Bank Holiday that marked the passing of that Age. He had foretold the coming of the cataclysm in *The War in the Air*. He became a great national figure, a prophet and more than a prophet, the founder of a new religion. In *God the Invisible King* the former agnostic preached a militant theism, on Manichaean lines. His *Outline of History* provided mankind with a new Cosmic Bible to supersede the worn-out Hebrew old clothes. He and President Wilson were responsible for the mood in which the portentous Covenant of the League of Nations was drawn up. In that old-fashioned but not unimportant country, the United States of America, his name still carries weight, and his *Outline* is a best-seller.

Back at the beginning of the century Max Beerbohm had a cartoon, 'The Spirit of Pure Reason crowns Mr. Wells First President of the New Republic.' The apotheosis of Mr. Wells could not last; to do him justice, he had too much humour to take his part seriously. 'Avec votre Etre Suprême vous commencez m'embêter,' said one of the unregenerate Jacobins of Robespierre at the Feast of the Supreme Being; but Mr. Wells himself got tired of God the Invisible King and apostatized from his own

religion. Before long he was openly mocking at the Covenant of the League of Nations. Mr. Britling couldn't see it through.

The Second World War, foretold in *The Shape of Things to Come*, was too much for Mr. Wells. He made a gallant attempt to readjust himself and drew up a new Declaration of the Rights of Man. (The original Declaration had asserted as 'a self-evident truth that man was created,' but Mr. Wells was by this time once more an Atheist.) President Wilson had long ago died broken-hearted, but President Franklin Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill drew up the Atlantic Charter, and the ship's company sang 'Abide with me.' But as the war went on, and still more after it stopped, Mr. Wells' doubts as to the final destiny of *Homo sapiens* continued to deepen. Eventually he wrote *Mind at the End of its Tether*. It would be easy to dismiss this last book as the work of a sick man; it is that, of course, but it is also the expression of a world-sickness; we cannot 'wholly impute his words to wayward sickliness and age in him.' Since he wrote, the Atomic Bomb has fallen on Hiroshima.

> 'The tongues of dying men
> Enforce attention like deep harmony:
> Where words are scarce, they are seldom spent in vain;
> For they breathe truth that breathe their words in pain.'

'Ordinary man is at the end of his tether. Only a small, highly adaptable minority of the species can possibly survive.'[1] 'A remnant shall be saved,' says Isaiah. Man needs to be adapted, to be made a new man by adoption and grace.

Mr. Herbert George Wells, born in 1866, was the son of a professional cricketer and of a former lady's maid. He belonged to Kent, and Kent in those days meant Hops, Beer, and the Sunshine that is best in England. He grew up under the shadow of Bladesover, the great house. He imagined, somewhat erroneously, that about 1688 England was all Bladesover. Throughout life he was intensely conscious of the gentry, and hostile to them. He inherited the Dickens tradition.

He was brought up Church of England. That is a fact of considerable importance in his history. It distinguished him at once from his friend and rival, the novelist of the Five Towns. Arnold Bennett was a Wesleyan from the Midlands, Wells a Churchman from the Home Counties. In late Victorian times that counted for a good deal, though Wells did not go to church, and Bennett stayed away from chapel. Perhaps the chief inheritance from his Church training which Mr. Wells retained was an intense dislike for clergymen; he disliked them even more than the gentry.

[1] *Mind at the End of its Tether*, p. 30.

After various adventures which were detailed in his autobiography, and under the thinnest of disguises in his novels, Wells became a science student at London University. The great influence in the scientific world at that time was Professor T. H. Huxley, Darwin's bulldog. Science, the Agnostics felt, had gained a resounding victory in the fight that began with the publication of *The Origin of Species*. But nothing particular happened; the Church still carried on, strongly entrenched socially and politically. Vast numbers of people ignored the new discoveries, and of those who did not, many were satisfied with the dishonest evasions, as they seemed to Agnostics, of *Lux Mundi* and the like. From his experience at South Kensington Mr. Wells brought away a bitter dislike for orthodox Christianity and a fervent belief in the value of Biology; a large proportion of the heroes of his novels are biologists.

The eighteen nineties, when Wells began his literary career, was a period of great promise, unfortunately only very partially redeemed. Apart from the Decadents who gave it the alliterative title of the Naughty Nineties, there were the Imperialist school of Kipling and Conrad, and the sociological writers of whom Wells and Bennett were the most famous. These latter used the form of the novel to describe a whole society, in the case of Mr. Bennett the industrial Midlands, and specifically the Five Towns; of Mr. Wells, London and the South-east. Bennett painted the life he knew so well in the spirit of a detached observer. 'This is how people live in Stoke and Burslem,' he seems to say. Wells, though far from oblivious to the lighter aspects of the Human Comedy, is constantly tilting against the bad social conditions, the product of human stupidity and want of imagination, which condemn multitudes of our town-bred population to a cramped, futile, petty existence. Mr. Lewisham, Kipps, Mr. Polly are the inglorious victims of our soulless industrial system. The last two, more by luck than good management, make a partial escape, but for the mass of the black-coated workers, to say nothing of the manual labourers, there is nothing but a maimed, warped caricature of what life might be.

His scientific fantasies show the same preoccupation with social conditions; visionary worlds are shadowed forth where our problems are solved, or where things have developed on different lines.

In *Tono-Bungay*, his greatest novel, Wells flies at higher game. Instead of dissecting like an entomologist the lower middle classes, he tells us something of the men who are running our civilisation — or who imagine that they are running it — flies on

the wheel for the most part, whom a facetious Chance has raised from nothing to the heights, the creatures of luck and advertisement. George Ponderevo, patentee of a quack medicine, Napoleon of finance, dies a dishonoured bankrupt at St. Jean de Luz. In *The New Machiavelli* he lays bare the base realities behind the imposing facade of our politics. The last-named novel belongs to the brief pageant of the reign of King Edward VII, when ominous cracks began to appear in the Victorian edifice.

Could a house built on such quaking foundations as European civilization survive the earthquake of war? That was the question Wells posed in his second greatest novel, *The War in the Air*. Many people on both sides of the North Sea foretold danger to their respective countries; Wells was the first influential writer to suggest that all Europe, nay all the world, was in danger of spontaneous combustion.

In August, 1914, in the eighth month, on the third day of the month, a feast which they had devised of their own heart, ended the Antonine Age of our modern civilization. All elderly people to-day must feel that their lives are divided into two halves, the period before and the period after the great cataclysm. For every year that has passed since 1914 makes it clearer that the War which was to end War was no thunderstorm that would clear the air, was no episode, but the First Act in a World Tragedy. World War No. 1 came to an end on what was called, very appropriately, Armistice Day: 1918 marked a cessation of arms, not a peace; so did 1945. We seem in the present year of grace (to use an obsolete term) further off from Peace than ever. We can hardly hope to make peace with Germany: Germany no longer exists. But in the (comparatively) happy days of the last war but one there was a really touching delusion that, once the Kaiser was hanged or otherwise disposed of, a Brave New World would spring into existence. Of this irrational Faith Mr. Wells, unwillingly and against his better judgement, became the Prophet.

A Prophet presupposes a God. Amid the darkness of the World War, Wells, *alias* Britling, discovered a God. It was characteristic of Mr. Wells that He was not anyone else's God, certainly not the God of the Christians. Possibly the Wellsian conception owes a little to the ancient Manichees, though as nobody, except perhaps the late Professor Burkitt, ever knew much about Manes, it is impossible to say. Mr. Wells' God is of limited power only, and is, in fact, rather the claimant to than the actual occupant of the Throne of the Universe, a God *in posse* rather than *in esse*. It is not necessary to enter on a detailed examination of the Wellsian theology, since he later repudiated it himself.

For the moment he seems to have held his new faith with a considerable degree of fervour. 'This book,' he says in *God the Invisible King*, 'is a religious book written by a believer.' And Mr. Sidney Dark in his *Outline of H. G. Wells* ecstatically declared, 'When Mr. Wells found God, the age of materialism definitely came to an end.'

We have no space to tell the melancholy story of the earthly representative of God the Invisible King, the League of Nations, set up at Geneva with all manner of costly furnishings, how the idol was vainly invoked by poor China, how in 1936 'he fell flat and shamed his worshippers,' so that by 1939 only the stump or shy part of Dagon was left, the tables of the Covenant having long ago been shivered into fragments.

Mr. Wells belonged to the giant race before the Flood; to us, poor survivors of the catastrophe, they seem 'mighty men that were of old, men of renown.' Among them were the two Rooseelts, Lord Curzon, Kipling, and, far the greatest of all, Mr. Winston Churchill. In all these men there was Titanic energy, infinite versatility. But they attempted too much; they lived at too igh pressure.

Dr. Johnson said of Shakespeare that vanquished Time toiled fter him in vain. With the gifted author of *The Time Machine* was rather the other way round. He could not keep up with ne march of events. Nobody could be more progressive, more orward-looking; he was always anticipating, and he made quite a umber of brilliantly successful guesses as to the future. But erverse mankind too often insisted on taking the wrong turning, ying off at a tangent. Eventually Mr. Wells came near to despair f his fellow-creatures. *Homo sapiens* began to look suspiciously ke Swift's Yahoo.

The wise Houyhnhnm having listened to Captain Gulliver's ccount of European politics and wars abruptly closed the narrar's lips, as we might turn off the wireless.

> 'I was going on to more particulars when my master commanded me silence. He said whoever understood the nature of Yahoos might easily believe it possible for so vile an animal to be capable of every action I had named, if their strength and cunning equalled their malice. But when a creature pretending to reason could be capable of such enormities, he dreaded lest the corruption of that faculty might be worse than brutality itself. He seemed confident therefore that instead of reason we were only possessed of some quality fitted to increase our natural vices: as the reflection of a troubled stream returns the image of an ill-shapen body not only larger but more distorted.'

ure reason embodied in a horse turned away with disgust from e spectacle of humanity.

Things will not mend till men begin to despair. 'Tout va bien ici,' wrote the French Revolutionary from Paris, 'le pain manque.' *Mankind at the End of its Tether* seems a better portent than certain Reports of the Church Assembly. Utopia does not exist; that is what the word means. We are strangers and pilgrims on the earth. 'For our citizenship is in Heaven, from whence also we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body.' So wrote St. Paul to the Philippians. It was when the Philippian gaoler was at the end of his tether that he uttered the heartbroken cry, 'What shall I do to be saved?'

We have read many pompous eulogies of Mr. Wells which leave us rather cold. Doubtless his last outburst will be hushed up as the inconsequent maunderings of delirium. But are not our politicians and ecclesiastics and publicists walking in a vain shadow and disquieting themselves in vain?

> 'Our world of self-delusion will perish amidst its evasions and fatuities. It is like a convoy lost in darkness on an unknown rocky shore, with quarrelling pirates in the chart-room and savages clambering up the sides of the ships to plunder and do evil as the whim may take them.' [2]

True, but not the whole truth. The Lord God omnipotent reigneth.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION: A FORGOTTEN CHAPTER

By Diana McClatchey, M.A.

THE rôle which the Church played in the establishment of primary education, particularly in the rural areas of this country, is well known. At the end of the eighteenth century Edward Smallwell, Bishop of Oxford, asked for specific information from his clergy as to the Charity Schools, either endowed or maintained by subscription, in their villages. The replies given in a series of Parochial Returns for 1793 show that in a considerable number of cases the incumbent himself was solely responsible for the existence of a school. This was so, for instance, at Bampton, Glympton, Steeple Aston and Great Rollwright. In other villages the parson played an active part in their upkeep and management. But it was in the mid-nineteenth century that such activity was at its height. A series of Returns made by Oxfordshire incumbents to Bishop Samuel Wilberforce in 1855 afford us a vivid glimpse of this chapter in the history of our National Education. We see

[2] *Mind at the End of its Tether*, p. 15.

the clergy housing the schools in their own barns and outbuildings, providing salary and accommodation for the teachers, and frequently undertaking the instruction themselves. Like Charles Kingsley, who wrote from Eversley in 1842, 'I go to school every day and teach as long as I can stand the heat and smell,' many an incumbent added daily teaching to the list of his increasing parochial responsibilities. In these Returns, and in others for the 1860's, we see intensive activities in connection with the National Society Schools, which replaced the earlier makeshift buildings. Here again it was generally the incumbent who took the initiative in stirring up local opinion and raising the necessary funds.

Although Oxfordshire was an agricultural and comparatively poor county, the proportion of scholars in public week-day schools to the total population of the county in 1858 was 8.3 per cent., according to the Report of the Commission on Public Education in 1860; and this was the third highest in the kingdom. Of the 403 public day schools in existence at this date, 370 were the responsibility of the Church of England. The Oxford Diocesan Board for Education was among the earliest to be founded, and was certainly one of the most active. Its income in 1857 amounted to £838 1*s.* 4*d.*, and was used not only in grants for the building and repair of schools, for books and apparatus, but also for exhibitions for students in Training Colleges. Culham, the Diocesan Training College for male students, came into existence in 1853.

Two Oxfordshire parsons are among those who make reports to the Commissioners of 1860. They are the Rev. G. Marshall, Vicar of Pyrton and Rural Dean, and the Rev. C. E. Ruck Keene, of Swincombe House, Henley. The former, Marshall, seems to represent the conventional outlook of the period on questions relating to the education of the working classes; the Rev. Keene, however, appears to stand for a more liberal and humane approach than we are led to believe was generally prevalent. Thus Marshall accepts the fact of boys of 11 leaving the day schools for work in the fields. 'If the boys can be kept in the Sunday School,' he writes, 'which must generally be managed by the inducement of a clothing club or something of the kind connected with the Sunday School, or if, as is sometimes the case, they return to the day school for the winter, after being employed in farm work during the summer months, there is no great reason to complain.' Keene, on the other hand, points out that 'though it often happens that children at a very early period make great progress at school, they must remain a certain time and to a certain age before the teacher's moral influence and the knowledge acquired can make any lasting

impression.' Little, he adds, can be expected when economic necessity leads to the withdrawal of the boys from rural schools at the age of 12 or under.

The difference between the two outlooks is revealed again on the question of the education of girls. For Marshall the desideratum was that the girls should be fitted at the village schools to take their places as domestic servants. He had no regrets that this education ended so early: 'they are after 14 engaged in some kind of service, or, if at home, so much occupied as to have little time to spare and they are better indoors.' Keene urges that 'under all circumstances 15 is the earliest period at which we should contemplate their leaving school.' Field husbandry for girls he vigorously condemned as not only undesirable but most pernicious in its effects upon the character and feelings of those who in future were to exercise so much influence for good or bad on family life. He also urges the inclusion of poetry in the strictly utilitarian curriculum of reading, writing, arithmetic and the 'elements of geography' (with housework added at the expense of writing for girls). 'Even in rural schools, where time allows the children to commit it to memory, it cannot be without its use in refining to some extent their minds.'

It is significant that much of the headway which popular education had made in Oxfordshire was attributed to the clergy. 'Education has been making rapid strides in country parishes of late years,' reports Marshall, 'mainly owing to Government Grants and the exertions of the clergy as a body.' Certainly many of the existing schools were unsatisfactory even by contemporary standards; the proportion of good schools to bad or indifferent is put by Marshall as low as one to ten or twelve. Nevertheless it would appear from the evidence that Oxfordshire clergy were aware to some extent of their responsibilities for making available to others the rudiments of an education which they themselves had been privileged to enjoy.

The general outlines of this story are well known. The links between the Established Church and Adult Education in this country are not, perhaps, so widely recognized. In the Bishop's Palace at Cuddesdon a series of Returns exist for the year 1867 which throw an interesting light on the extent and character of adult education in a rural area during the mid decades of the last century. The incumbents are asked for details of the provision made for adult education in their parishes, and of the success which had accompanied the experiment. The replies give us the following information. Out of 208 Oxfordshire villages, evening

lasses for young people, for adults, or for both together, existed n all but 49. That is, in 76.5 per cent. of these villages some rovision existed for education over and above the basic minimum rovided for children; and this at a time when the Act of 1870 ad not yet made the provision of education in any form a statutory bligation. Whatsoever existed did so as the result of voluntary nitiative, and was supported largely from voluntary sources.

What was the character of this education? From the comments f the incumbents we see these evening classes meeting once, vice or three times a week during the autumn and winter. As we ould expect, instruction for the most part was limited to read- g, writing and arithmetic. Details of the provision made for eligious instruction are given elsewhere, and it is not apparently ncluded under this heading. Mention of lectures and singing asses at Cottesford indicate that even at this stage adult educa- on in some instances went further than bare instruction in the ree R's. The provision of teachers, as indeed the launching of e classes, appears to have been the responsibility of the in- mbent. In a number of cases he himself teaches. This was , for instance, at Haseley, Glympton, Fringford and Little- ore. In other villages the parson invoked the services of his mily. At South Newington there is a comment to the effect that e Rector and his wife had both attempted to hold evening asses, neither, it would seem, with remarkable success. At Crow- arsh we hear of the Rector's daughter teaching in the night hool. In other villages the teaching appears to have been on a gher level. At Stratton Audley we hear of the appointment of special master, and at Shipton-under-Wychwood instruction ems to have been well organized. '. . . By means of lay services, ndly rendered, we have an efficient staff, and are able to instruct men and boys during the winter. Some have learnt to write well three months, and others are proficient in arithmetic.' At Mix- ry, too, there is significance in the comment that 'the evening hool is popular, and capable of any extension, according to Staff d teachers.'

Instruction was not always free for the scholars. At Souldern, the school attended by thirty young men, we are told that 'coal d candles are partly provided by subscription.' At Hanwell ere is a comment that 'even with a small payment the people adly avail themselves of the evening classes'; and at Eynsham, o, classes were supported partly by subscription and partly by e payments of the scholars.

Apart from instruction, attempts were made in a number of Oxfordshire villages to provide a suitable and educational book-supply. In addition to the tracts and pamphlets supplied on a large scale by the S.P.C.K. to incumbents for sale or distribution in their parishes, free parochial Lending Libraries existed in 23 of the market towns and villages, according to earlier Returns made in 1834. In a number of cases, Garsington, Great Tew, Whitchurch and Yarnton, for example, it is specifically stated that these libraries had been originated by the incumbent or curate. We know that as early as 1736 the Rev. C. Aldrich of Henley left his own extensive and varied library to act as the nucleus of a free parochial lending library. Works of religious and moral instruction were probably numerous in these village collections, but if we are to judge by the still extant Henley catalogue, there was a high proportion of works on history, geography, natural science and the classics. Clearly, on a voluntary footing, long before the County Library Van Service appeared in these villages, the provision of educational reading matter was by no means ignored.

What success crowned these early experiments in rural Adult Education? Both Marshall and Keene comment in glowing terms upon the evening classes held in the county. 'No institution in the Kingdom, I believe, is more deservedly popular with rich and poor than night schools—particularly in agricultural parishes,' re-reports Marshall. 'Some scholars come from a wish to improve themselves: their example brings others, while a warm well-lighted room, instead of the discomforts of home, is not without its effect.' The Rev. Keene was equally enthusiastic, and for more than one reason. 'Evening Schools,' he writes, 'are most valuable for boys and young men. Even if they only afforded a harmless opportunity for filling up, as it were, the interval between the hour when the daily labour ceases and the time for going to rest, during the winter evenings, it would be very desirable to encourage them; but inasmuch as they seem to offer the only means of continuing the scant period usually allotted to learning in the day schools, and as there appears to be a growing disposition to profit by any moments of leisure, where the means of instruction are at hand I feel that they claim every encouragement which can be given to them.' He also adds that lectures are often found very attractive, and foresees that as schools improve and education advances there will be a growing desire for such mode of instruction. As for the libraries, both correspondents speak in their favour. Keene, who here again reveals a more liberal outlook, comments that 'they are everywhere popular, and may be made very beneficial by a

roper but not too restrictive selection of books, so that a wide cope should be allowed to meet the varied tastes of the readers, nd only to exclude immoral, irreligious and frivolous publica- ions.' When possible, he considered some small subscription nould be made for their use, 'but I would not allow the failure of uch subscription to prevent the establishment of such useful in- titutions.' We get a more detailed and accurate impression by urning once more to local sources.

If we are to judge by the comments of the incumbents, vening classes were by no means a universal success. The posi- on varied from village to village. At Ardley an evening school eld twice a week for men and once for women, from November o Easter, was said to be a 'remarkable success.' At Chinnor, owley, Shopton-under-Wychwood, Spelsbury, Stonesfield, Iongewell, and a number of other places the experiments are eported as unqualified successes, and the classes well attended. ut the number of places where failure is reported is equally gnificant. At Weston-on-the-Green, Maple Durham, Oddington nd Rotherfield Peppard, for example, evening classes had been ried, and failed. Sometimes reasons are suggested. The com- ents at Over Worton, 'no further education required,' and at omerton, 'when the children have learnt to write in the day chool they are not keen after work,' tell their own story. There a familiar ring about the complaints at Haseley, 'numbers acken after a time,' and at Blackbourton, that the classes simply id not 'take' in the village: Interesting, too, is the observation y the incumbent at Ascot-under-Wychwood, that his efforts to stablish a school had met with no success, since all the young men ere under the influence of the Dissenting Minister,, for a long me the only teacher of children in the village. Indeed, to any- ne with acquaintance of the numerous and incalculable factors hich determine the success of one village class and the failure f another, the varied fates of these experiments will cause no rprise.

It is clear that considerations other than the mental equipment f their parishioners weighed with the incumbents in launching ese evening classes. A few characteristic comments tell their wn story. From the incumbent of Marsh Baldon: 'I am strongly f the opinion that a winter evening school is a great instrument r good in the parish, since it acts beneficially upon the lads and oung men, who, if left to themselves during the winter evenings, e exceedingly apt to become wild and unruly.' From Burford e incumbent states: 'The evening school tends to civilize the oung men, and produces friendly feeling toward the clergyman.'

At Tackley and Standlake the classes were commended as affording great moral influence with the scholars; and most telling of all, perhaps, is the naïveté of the comment from Sydenham: 'I find the influence of Ladies very great upon the lads who attend our Night School.'

Rural paternalism was at its height in the mid-nineteenth century. The Squire, the Parson and the Justice of the Peace — the functions often interchangeable — were more clearly than ever before the undisputed arbiters of rural well-being. Several factors had contributed to bring about this state of affairs. On the one hand, the social status of the clergy of the Established Church tended to rise throughout the first half of the century. Recruited, in the main, from a higher social grade, coming to livings the value of which had been increased either by Queen Anne's Bounty, by Parliamentary grants, or by the same Enclosure movement which had impoverished their parishioners, the social and economic gulf between the parson and his village parishioners widened visibly during the nineteenth century. At the same time a much closer relation grew up between them. The non-resident incumbent had virtually disappeared by the mid-nineteenth century. Instead of hurried weekly visits from a curate who came out from Oxford to serve his cure, or hurried between two or even three churches in the county, the parson and his family now lived in the village. Indeed, it was to make residence in these country livings tolerable and befitting to the requirements of a gentleman and his family that the Diocesan Church Building Society, founded in 1847, did so much to assist and encourage the building of the extensive parsonage houses, with their stables, wine-cellars, and ambitious grounds — those parsonage houses which still crouch to-day, like so many cumbersome white elephants, in the centre of almost all our English villages. Moreover, the whole conception of parochial responsibility widened and deepened during the nineteenth century. Both the Evangelical and the Tractarian movements bore their fruits in these isolated Oxfordshire villages. Not only were the services far more frequent at church, but Sunday schools, Confirmation classes, cottage meetings and sick visiting all became the general rule rather than the exception they had tended to be in the majority of rural parishes during the previous century. Again, as parents, the villagers were brought into contact with the parson through the founding of the National Society Schools; not infrequently they met him in the capacity of Justice of the Peace, over matters concerned with infringements of the law; and it was from the parsonage family that, in times of acute need, they received the charitable doles of food or clothing.

It is against this background that the early experiments in rural Adult Education must be seen. There was no overt reaction from clerical paternalism in the Oxfordshire villages during these years. But the same forces which led the villagers to neglect the village church, with its class-stratified system of pews and free sittings, and to seek the meetings of Primitive Methodists or Baptists, where, in the homely atmosphere of barn or cottage, they could hear the Gospel message proclaimed by men whose way of life they knew and shared, and could find in this 'poor man's church' a dignity and self-esteem which it was becoming increasingly difficult for them to find in their relations with the clergy of the Established Church, these same forces tended to keep many villagers away from the 'Parson's Night School'; for here, more than ever, all the divisions and barriers would be emphasized. On the other hand, there were others who were glad to avail themselves by any means of the tools which would make later self-education possible.

It is a far cry from the picture given in the Parochial Returns of the 1860's to Adult Education of the 1940's. Different conceptions now prevail, and a new chapter both of rural history and of education is in process of being written. But the facts revealed by these nineteenth century incumbents are nevertheless impressive. Not only was the need for some provision for Adult Education in every village officially recognized by the Bishop of Oxford, but, in the majority of cases, the incumbents had taken steps to provide at least the first stages of Adult Education.

Few people to-day advocate the Church's official entry into the field of Adult Education. The work can more effectively be done by organisations such as the Workers' Educational Association—the people's own educational movement, governed by the students, responsive to their needs, and thus enjoying advantages which the Church has long since lost; or by the Universities, with their established tradition of free intellectual inquiry. There is, however, a crying need in practically every district for suitable tutors to take weekly adult classes in a wide range of subjects. Is not this a function to which Modern Churchmen might give serious consideration? Experience of Adult Education in one of the rural areas of this country affords ample evidence of the much more helpful and effective part which the Church through it representatives, both lay and clerical, might be playing in promoting and supporting attempts to further Adult Education. Certainly the task is not always an easy one. The experience of the 1860's affords warnings to all and sundry. If a village class is to succeed—and at its best it can become a co-operative quest for

understanding on the part of tutor and students alike, in which the experience of the most insignificant member can be utilised—then a special obligation rests upon those who bring to it particular abilities. How many classes have failed through the well-meaning attempts of the Vicar to 'guide' discussion into desirable channels, to 'draw a moral,' or to slip into pulpit habits instead of merely contributing to the discussion! On the other hand, how many classes have been brought into existence by his good offices, and benefited by his support. Again, the well-informed, perhaps university trained, member, though he or she may be a godsend to a village class, may also be its ruin. Let there be the least suspicion of patronage or condescension and the class is doomed. It is no longer the villagers' affair; it belongs to the 'gentry," and that particular experiment can be written off as a failure. There is no need for this to happen : the success of numerous village classes which comprise a genuine cross-section of the population is evidence enough of the efficacy of normal tact and imagination.

The Adult Education movement of this century claims Churchmen of the calibre of the late William Temple, Dr. Cranage and Albert Mansbridge among its founders. The future is a dismal one if their lead cannot awaken a more vigorous response. The need for Adult Education at the present time, for a more realistic understanding on the part of the folk who make up this democracy, both of the world in which we are living and the problems which confront us, is obvious. In these days of crisis we cannot afford to wait for a gradual rise in the educational level by means of the raising of the school-leaving age by one or two years. That indeed can never solve the problem; it can at best equip the children more adequately for the education which must be pursued in later years. It is time that Adult Education received a higher priority of attention on the national agenda.

It is humbling, then, to realize that we have made such inadequate use of these foundations laid by the pioneers of eighty years ago.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S BRAINS TRUST

WE are grateful not only to the members of the present 'session' of the Brains Trust, but also to the readers who have sent in the questions from which we have selected three. We value their co-operation. Questions should be of general interest to the layman who, though not claiming to be an expert in theology, has a real concern with matters pertaining to religion and theology. We believe that the Modernist, free as he is from the fetters which hamper the Traditionalist, though even more appreciative perhaps of the abiding value of the best thought and aspiration of our fathers of old time, can provide answers which have a special value by reason of their frankness. Questions should be written as concisely as possible on a post-card addressed to The M.C. Brains Trust, The Vicarage, Stithians, Truro, Cornwall.

QUESTION I

As God knows our necessities before we ask, why ask instead of leaving Him to give or withhold as He judges best?

God's giving or withholding depends not only on His wise judgement but on our capacity for co-operation with it. Man, in the Christian view, is related to God, not as clay to potter, but as child to parent; and in the child-parent relationship asking has an essential, though by no means only, place. A child is encouraged to ask, and in his experience of the answers received he may learn to refine his asking through having come to understand his parent better. As insight into the lessons of life and God's ways therein deepens, our petitions will become more conformable to what He knows to be our necessities. Our ideas of what constitutes necessities change, as experience in recent years has shown. Life is an education into the meaning of necessities. Christians in their approach to God claim the freedom of access which belongs to children. Asking doesn't involve clamour or demand; we ask rather in order to leave God freer course 'to give or withhold as He judges best.' A. G. COOMBS.

I agree entirely. If God is our Father, it seems natural for us, the children, to express our wishes freely to Him. No one ever heard of a silent family. One important aspect of prayer is sometimes forgotten. No wise man thinks he can influence God; but every wise man uses prayer that God may influence him. R. B. HENDERSON.

Yes. To ask for the right thing at the right time in the right way from the right Person implies that the asker is ready and eager to receive the thing asked for and knows from Whom it comes. I believe that there are some things which God, knowing our needs, hands to us, but which we only receive if we want them and take them and are in contact with Him to get them. I would gladly give my cat a Greek Grammar. It needs one; know-

ledge of Greek would, in many ways, broaden its outlook. But I can't give it without the right co-operation from the cat, which is not forthcoming. N. S. Power.

QUESTION II

Can man, product of heredity and environment, with justice be either praised or blamed for his conduct?

This is, in effect, a hypothetical question. No Christian and very few, if any, philosophers would admit the antecedent; therefore the consequent cannot be proved from it. Man is partly, but not entirely, the result of heredity and environment. This applies to all sentient creatures. They are much circumscribed, and the lower the organism, the less the margin of freedom; but there is always a margin. In man the margin is greater than in any other earthly creature. True, some have bigger margins of freedom than others; but none is completely bound either by heredity or environment. It is on the use made of the margin that man is judged. If he uses it in furtherance of God's plan for him and the universe, two results always follow; first, the margin will increase (to him that hath shall be given), and, second, the right use of the margin extends a subtle influence over the remaining, and often larger, part of a man's life, so that he learns to do all that he has to do as to the Lord and not unto men. R. B. Henderson.

I agree with Mr. Henderson. Man is only partly the product of heredity and environment. Within limits (probably smaller than we imagine) we have moral responsibility. To deny this is to make nonsense of everything. I suspect that it is a form of escapism from moral responsibility like the revival of Satan as a scapegoat.

Incidentally, this question of moral responsibility was put recently to the Royal Society. One hundred and seventy-three Fellows said that man was, in some degree, responsible, and only seven thought he was not.

Dr. Hathaway writes: 'The effects of personality on glands are more impressive and easier to illustrate than the effects of glands on personality.' (See chapter i in Fosdick's *On Being a Real Person.*) N. S. Power.

Though we are not entirely responsible for the limitations imposed upon our moral freedom by heredity and environment, we are responsible for the use we make of those limitations. I would add that seriousness of moral conviction must lead us to realise that we have a very direct responsibility for our sins and the part those sins play in shaping both heredity and environment. Those who enjoy what Mr. Henderson calls the bigger margins of freedom must of course be concerned to see them extended to others, including the generations yet unborn. A. G. Coombs.

QUESTION III

In what sense was Jesus God Incarnate? If He was metaphysically as well as morally unique, does it not follow that the Incarnation involved a miraculous break in the natural order?

I agree with the questioner that metaphysical uniqueness would involve a break in the natural order. For me it would also deprive the life of Jesus of value. If He were of a different order of being, what use to attempt to be like Him?

I believe that there is 'something of God' in every personality, that the ideal for mankind is to live at one with that divine spark, to share the divine life, to be, in a real sense, Sons and Daughters of God. In so far as we fall short of this ideal, we are not perfectly human, but imperfectly human.

Jesus lived at one with this 'divine spark.' He was at one with God, the unique Son of God, not because of metaphysical uniqueness, but because of His unique self-dedication to God's service. He was divine by the perfection of His humanity, at one with the Father in love, in will, in moral character (not, of course, in power or wisdom; that would not be compatible with a human life). In this sense I believe that Jesus is God incarnate.

This problem became intelligible to me for the first time when I read chapter xi in Dr. Major's 'Noble Lectures, *English Modernism*. I advise the questioner to read it. N. S. POWER.

I support Mr. Power's' answer all along the line, and have only one suggestion to make. Drop the question-begging word 'unique.' I think it arose originally from a misreading of the Fourth Gospel. Uniqueness cannot be proved, and unprovable claims cause the enemy to blaspheme. I recommend Rendel Harris' *Prolegomena to the Fourth Gospel*. R. B. HENDERSON.

The only interpretation of the Incarnation that will accord with Christ's own teaching about God and man must be in terms of personal relationship, not in abstract categories. The whole impression that He made upon His followers included a real conviction of His human personality; but, at the same time, He stood apart, isolated, not understood. In the light of the Crucifixion—Resurrection experience they came by a leap of faith to evaluate the signficance of His life in terms of a complete disclosure of God in history. In the human Jesus, in a manner therefore compatible with the natural order, God had 'visited and redeemed His people.' A. G. COOMBS.

BOOK REVIEWS

A PLAIN MAN LOOKS AT THE CROSS

Mr. Weatherhead has written a book* for the plain man who looks at the Cross and wonders what it means, but quite frankly I do not think that the plain man will be greatly helped by it. To say this may seem uncharitable and even impertinent, for the book is obviously the fruit of deep meditation and intense devotion to our Lord. But the plain man is neither a mystic nor a theologian, and I fear that he will be puzzled rather than enlightened by much that Mr. Weatherhead has written. What, for example, will he make of the following passage, which is typical of many?

> 'Illustrations are not arguments, but I can imagine that as the seas divide the continents, so time divides the generations, but below the dividing seas, past men, present men and future men, preserving individuality, are yet one, and a Timeless Divine Being entering humanity with the power of a God could influence the whole of humanity, past, present and future' (pp. 69-70).

It is difficult to gather from this book any clear answer to the question, Why did Jesus die on the Cross and what does His death signify? Mr. Weatherhead explains how the opposition to our Lord's ministry developed and how at last He had either to renounce His claim to be the Messiah or accept the inevitable consequences; he admits that Christ was the perfect Martyr—'the greatest example in history of the way in which man should

* *A Plain Man looks at the Cross*, by Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A. (Independent Press. 6/-. 1945.)

react even . . . to circumstances which make the ultimate demand of life itself' (p. 90); and he proceeds to explain how the Cross reveals God's love:

> 'The reaction of Jesus to sin . . . meant . . . to go on loving and loving and loving, until man, seeing what sin cost God the only Lover of souls, turned in horror from his sinful ways and began a new life' (p. 93).

Here one would think we must necessarily have reached the heart of the matter — that the Cross reveals God's love. But instead we are told that 'this view . . . goes a long way, but it does not go far enough' (p. 94). Yet at the conclusion of the next chapter, which is intended to bring us as near as possible to the central meaning of the Cross, we read:

> 'The reaction of Jesus to sin in 29 A.D. is the reaction of God to my sin to-day. . . . That suffering love . . . is the self giving of God in a love which is my only hope of being changed until I am all that He can make me' (p. 129).

Is there really any difference between these two statements? Mr. Weatherhead says that we shall never be saved by 'our power to react sufficiently to what the cross reveals' (p. 94). Perhaps not; but surely there must be the human response to God's self giving. What hope can there be of our salvation until our moral consciousness is sufficiently alive to make that response?

What Mr. Weatherhead has written about the Cross is determined by his conception of redemption, and this in turn by his doctrine of Christ and his doctrine of man. It is impossible to question the technical orthodoxy of Mr. Weatherhead's Christology. He states repeatedly his firm belief in our Lord's true humanity not less than in His divinity. Yet we never meet in this book with a Christ who is *at once* both human and divine. The human Jesus and the divine Son of God appear with a bewildering alternation, and for all the author says to the contrary, I suspect that the 'plain man' will feel that Christ's humanity is no more than a temporary disguise.

And in any case it is only fair that a book for the plain man should begin at the plain man's level, wherever it may end; and the plain man does think of our Lord as a real man. It is from that starting point that he must be led if he is to realize that our Lord was not only human but divine as well. Mr. Weatherhead, however, starts from the opposite end.

> 'Let us think, now, therefore,' he says, 'not of a Man, however noble and heroic, who walked the streets and lanes of Palestine. . . . Let us begin with the thought of a Divine Being, the Second Person in the Holy Trinity, who dwelt in the bosom of the Father' (p. 99).

It is this thought, the thought of a Divine Being enjoying a conscious and fully personal life with God the Father and consenting to leave that life and live amongst men, which dominates Mr. Weatherhead's idea of the Incarnation. He does not appear to think that it is at all symbolic or metaphorical and it allows no room for any such doctrine as that of the 'logos spermatikos' immanent in every human spirit. Between the divine Son and mankind there is no real relationship. Hence the Incarnation means the *imprisonment* of 'pure, unhampered, infinite spirit in the bondage of a human brain, human instincts and human flesh' (p. 102). What it implies is illustrated with more force than grace by the following simile:

> 'Would you be willing to become a monkey, and live with monkeys for monkeys? Would you exchange your ways and habits for the life you see on Monkey Hill at the London Zoo? Even if you would you would not do what Christ did, for you would only exchange one flesh for another flesh, one place for another place, one limited life for another' (p. 102).

Moreover this 'imprisonment in humanity' does not end with the end of our Lord's life upon earth.

> 'He escaped at death from the prison of time and space. He escaped the bondage of the flesh. But not from the burden and limitation of our humanity. . . . His shrinking from the Cross, then, I take to be the first shock of His own realisation that the sin of man would prove to be so deep and long continued that the task of Redemption would involve His age-long imprisonment in humanity, involving a measure of separation from God while all He essentially was cried out for the unity He had with God before time began' (p. 105).

It is this realization, we are told, which accounts for the agony in Gethsemane.

Mr. Weatherhead is obviously unhappy that Christ should have shrunk from the Cross. At the bottom of his mind he appears to think that the Son of God should have betrayed no fear or apprehension. Hence his theory that it was not the fear of death upon the Cross which caused our Lord's agony in the garden, but the thought that 'the barrier of His humanity, even in the spirit world, would bar Him from the Godhood which once He knew' (p. 104). Again one wonders what the plain man will conclude from all this. Perhaps he will not realize how much of it is simply the author's fancy.

My chief criticism of the book has already been stated; it is that the writer traces no essential relationship between the Christ and ourselves. Nowhere in this book is there any suggestion that man is or ever was made in the image of God; or that there is that within him which is potentially divine. Christ is the 'Divine Invader' (p. 120) rather than 'the light which lighteneth every man coming into the world.' The idea of the divine Son becoming *imprisoned* (Mr. Weatherhead uses the word so often that it is evidently carefully chosen) in human flesh savours of Gnostic heresy rather than orthodox Christianity. And it is because of this lack of relationship between Christ and mankind that Mr. Weatherhead is unable to set before us a coherent presentation of our Lord's person in which the human and the divine form one person and not two.

But if we can come to see that our Saviour was divine *because* of His perfect humanity, then the example both of His life and of His death will come to have a meaning and a value for us which they can possess in no other way.

D. L. Scott.

THE RESEARCHES AND REFLECTIONS OF A COUNTRY PARSON*

Risby Church with its ancient round tower, the sanctuary of a picturesque Suffolk village, has been worthily commemorated by its Rector. In *Risby*, a well-printed volume of nearly 200 pages, Mr. Webling has written the history of his parish. The author is a gifted writer and is extremely sensitive to natural beauty. Many, who are in no sense archaeologists but are lovers of the English country-side and country people, will find *Risby* most readable. This parish history is no bare recital of facts: it is illuminated by descriptions and humanized by personal reflections and experiences.

Mr. Webling has collected an amazing body of minute facts and has woven them into a narrative, or rather a succession of narratives, with great literary skill. He acknowledges with modesty and gratitude the help and guidance of gifted archaeologists.

The round tower of Risby Church at once arouses archaeological interest

* *Risby*, by A. F. Webling (Edmund Ward, Leicester. 10/6. 1945.)

as do the wonderful round towers in the ancient cathedrals and churchyards of Ireland. In their origin they would seem to have been not sanctuaries for Divine worship, but places of refuge from savage invaders. Possibly in some cases a combination of both, as was the ecclesiastical pile of Durham described by Sir Walter Scott: 'Half house of God, half fortress 'gainst the Scot.' Another good example in the North County is Bedale Church in Yorkshire with its square west-end tower which possesses a portcullis. This double use may account for the close connection of these round towers with the local churches. The churches are all of later date than the towers, which are certainly pre-Norman. There are some forty of them in Suffolk alone.

The defensive character of Risby Church tower is indicated by the fact that its

> 'lowest windows contemporary with the structure are eighteen feet from the ground: they are splayed, with narrow apertures on the outer side. The tower has no doorway but, high up on the east side, there is a narrow arched opening. This was originally the only entrance. . .' (p. 30).

Risby, the advowson of which was originally held by the great Abbey of St. Edmundsbury, became, after the dissolution of the monasteries, a well-endowed parish and possessed a more distinguished line of parsons than is usual in small country parishes. Mr. Webling has collected interesting details about many of them, but makes no reference to the last, but not the least, of his long line of predecessors, Maurice Pryke (son of the Chancellor of Exeter Cathedral), who was presented to the living by Lord Haldane. He arrived in Risby in 1925 with a strained heart, due to overwork, and died within fifteen months. He was a man of great mental, moral and physical energy, and produced a valuable and vigorous volume entitled *The Working Faith of a Modernist,* published by Heffer's in 1925.

In his concluding pages the parish historian directs his glance from the past into the future. He is painfully conscious that the village church is a declining influence for good in our nation's life. Yet he hopes for the best, but realizes that if the remedy is to be secured the new must, in some measure replace the old. He writes:

> 'Profound changes, the effect of which is not yet fully apparent, have already been made in the religious habits of our people. Here, again, centralization is elbowing out that which is local and individual, the broadcast service supplanting the amateurish efforts of the village church. . . . That changes will come is certain. Unless our churches are to be handed over to the Office of Works as antiquarian curiosities, they too must change. . . . I think that adaptation to changing needs will come, not catastrophically but, after our English manner, gradually though inevitably. Not by revolutionary methods, but by the infiltration of new and (one hopes) better things. The dropping of outmoded beliefs and old unhappy far-off controversies will not be accompanied by shouts of battle and garments rolled in blood, for no one now cares sufficiently about them. What is vital and essential in the old must be presented in ways comprehensible by and serviceable to the men of later days. Exactly what forms that will take no one knows, but, in line with the trend of developing thought, it seems likely that the religion which is really to influence the future will be based on a few essential facts rather than a multitude of conjectures founded on tradition and speculative metaphysics. Working hypotheses will be deduced from the facts and tested by experience' (p. 188).

The charm of Mr. Webling's book is increased by a number of pen-and-ink drawings by Sidney T. Beeson, R.S.A. H.D.A.M.

TRENDS IN AMERICAN RELIGION *

* *Christianity and the Contemporary Scene.* Edited by Randolph Crump Miller and Henry H. Shires. (Morehouse-Gorham Co. $3.00.)
Church, College and Nation, by G. Roy Elliott. (The Cloister Press, Louisville. $2.00.)

The Jubilee Volume of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California, is a very interesting collection of essays.

In his essay on 'Some Trends in American Theology,' Professor Randolph C. Miller observes that the most profound influence has been that of the 'dialectical theology' emanating from Karl Barth and disseminated by Emil Brunner and H. Kraemer. All the same, it has not caused many Americans to become Barthians, though it has made them re-think their theology. He points out that this neo-orthodoxy leads to irrationalism because of the complete dichotomy between reason and revelation. In spite of the Barthians, the announced demise of theological liberalism has been premature; its new understanding of the Bible has permeated the most conservative circles, and it has made both theology and Christian evidences more acceptable to twentieth century minds. The liberals may have been chastened by world events, since they are better able than most others to read the signs of the times, but this has led to a strengthened liberalism, not to its demise.

> 'Liberalism is not a set of beliefs; liberalism is not a theology. Liberalism is an attitude towards seeking truth at any cost to cherished opinions; it is the conviction that revelation is still open, and that men can find God's truth by honest searching.'

Dr. George Morrel, in his paper on Recent Contributions of Continental Theology, holds that the Barthians should be credited with one notable contribution to contemporary Christian thought, namely an intelligent representation of Augustinianism; it has forced the modern world to take account of that tradition.

> 'It has reminded man of his fallenness and his utter dependence upon God for every good thing—a very wholesome thing for man to remember . . . It has brought to judgment the whole anthropocentric tendency in religion.'

Dr. Henry M. Shires gives an interesting assessment of American Christianity. The first characteristic which he notes is the remarkable diversity of denominations of which a recent census revealed that there were over 200. A second characteristic is a pronounced activism, a certain impatience with theory apart from practical consequences. A third characteristic is democratic feeling expressed in forms of church government. A further note of American Christianity has been a remarkable degree of 'missionary-mindedness'; it has been concerned for the expansion of the faith. A fifth characteristic has been a considerable degree of interdenominational co-operation.

Professor Everett Bosshard has some interesting reflections in his essay on 'A Christian Analysis of Western Political Philosophy.'

> 'The liberal ideal of the state as a policeman guarding the rights of individual initiative regardless of the injustices the strong may inflict on the weak is gone. This state is developing into a nurse, a schoolmaster, an employer, and perhaps even a priest. The great danger that Christians have to meet is not that of violent persecution but rather that of the crushing out of religion from modern life by the sheer weight of the mass organization of society on a purely secular basis. Not only

Marxianism but the secular movements of social reform and rehabilitation have taken on a spiritual significance based on doctrines of the nature and end of man and of society that rival Christian doctrine.'

Altogether, this volume of essays will well repay study. The reader on this side of the Atlantic will discover that not a few of the problems with He is a 'high' Episcopalian, and as an educationist he is concerned for writers.

Professor Elliott's book is written from a somewhat different standpoint. He is a 'high' Episcopalian, and as an educationalist he is concerned for the rising generation of college students. Though not systematically taught to reject religion, he holds that they are being quietly educated out of all Christian belief; for the secular college 'is definitely moulding American culture into a non-Christian form.' Professor Elliott declares that the academic mind, whenever it has been exercised independently, 'has been opposed to the central mysteries of historic religion.' Thus 'traditional or Catholic Christianity cannot get a real hearing in our secular colleges.' His solution is to found chairs of orthodox Christianity in the colleges.

But even if this were done, who can guarantee that the students would attend the lectures, unless 'orthodox Christianity' were made a compulsory subject for examination—like 'Divvers' formerly at Oxford? And an even greater difficulty would be that the students would be quick to perceive what a gulf in method lies between the 'orthodox' lectures, and those, let us say, of the history professor. One cannot serve God and Mammon—objective truth and theological correctitude.

While one cannot but sympathize with Professor Elliott's misgivings, for a tide of cultural barbarism does threaten to overwhelm us all—even on this side of the Atlantic, we doubt whether it can be dealt with by the device he suggests. If the quality of education given by these American colleges is really first-rate, the students should develop some other attitude to life than 'urbane materialism.' J. C. H.

THE INTENTION OF JESUS *

Fresh studies in the life of Jesus appear almost incessantly, and thus a constant witness is borne to the abiding interest which His personality stimulates. In the nature of things, however, they cannot all have a similarly abiding value. Many, in fact, in attempting to be original succeed only in being eccentric, whilst others merely repeat what has been said already, and often said much better. But the reverse of this can also be true and sometimes a book will appear which makes no pretence to great originality, and yet by its restatement and reinterpretation of the subject matter proves after all to be original in no small degree. Professor Bowman's *Intention of Jesus** is a book of this kind and it should soon be on the shelves of every New Testament student. It is, as the author rightly claims, 'a distillation of the best results of modern research into the subject treated' (p. 9). But it is more than this, for the exposition of the writer's thesis is so persuasive and satisfying that it is hard at times not to feel that the argument is much more novel than it actually is.

The object of Prof. Bowman's work is to show how deeply rooted the intention of Jesus was in the noblest ethical and spiritual strata of the Old Testament prophetic literature; and as an integral part of this object he is at pains to demonstrate the genuine identity between the Jesus of history and the Jesus of the Gospel record.

* *The Intention of Jesus*, by John W. Bowman. (S.C.M. Press. 1945. 8/6.)

'By reason of his matchless genius (Jesus) was able to gather up the best in the (prophetic) tradition and to make that distillation his own *intention,* to be taught and lived with resolution to the death . . . And his originality is nowhere so clearly evident as in the fact that his spiritual insight saw unerringly what would eventuate if the prophet's *best* . . . were brought together in a single life and so subjected to the subtle alchemy of a personality in which that best should be incarnated' (pp. 196-7).

The intention of Jesus was to fulfil in His own person the *rôle of the Messiah of the Remnant* (i.e. the most spiritualized and universalized Messianic concept that the Old Testament contains) and with that to combine the sôle of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. It was just in this, thinks Prof. Bowman, in the vital union which Jesus effected between these two ideas that His genius was most truly revealed.

'Translate these Hebraic expressions into their Greek equivalents and they become the common coin of Christian speech: for 'Suffering Servant' put *the Crucified Saviour*: for 'Messiah,' *Lord;* for 'Remnant,' *Church.* Now read them together: *the Crucified Saviour, the Lord of the Church*! . . . It is that simple combination of phrases that is responsible for the transformation of a religion. Apart, they lay sterile in the prophetic literature. Brought into relation with one another, they formed together the living seed out of which the Christian faith was born' (p. 76).

That the background of our Lord's thought was of a purely prophetic nature, Prof. Bowman strongly insists. He does not allow that His Messianic ideas were influenced by the Apocalyptists even to the smallest extent. The so-called 'Little Apocalypse' in Mark xiii is accepted as an authentic utterance of Jesus, but it is interpreted in an anti-apocalyptic sense.

'Jesus,' the writer concluded, 'may well be called the great *counter-apocalyptist* of the Jewish tradition' (p. 61).

Whether this interpretation is entirely convincing may be open to doubt, and it may also be doubted whether the writer does full justice to the moral and spiritual teaching which some at least of the Apocalyptic writings contained. But these are minor details, and in maintaining that it was not from these sources that the intention of Jesus really took its form and origin (as Schweitzer and his followers have supposed) Prof. Bowman is surely correct.

But who was this Jesus, whose intention it was to be at once the Messiah of the Remnant and the Suffering Servant of the Lord? Was He the real, individual Jesus who lived in Palestine, or was He the creation of the Christian Church? That He was indeed the real Jesus, the whole argument of the book is designed to shew.

'Where, it may well be asked, does originality generally lie — with the individual or with the community? Surely experience is in favour of its lying with the individual. It is the individual that is creative in every phase of human life . . . And if one may predict, it will be the recovery of a saner view relative to the creative potentialities residing in a community that will drive out the Form Critical solution in its more radical statement. To say that the Church produced the faith by which it lives is to affirm the possibility of an ethico-spiritual perpetual motion machine. This surely is as contrary to the laws that operate in the spiritual world as to those functioning in the physical realm' (p. 80).

It is, then, with the Messianic consciousness of Jesus Himself that our concern and interest lie.

> 'That consciousness can only have arisen out of his profound insight into the nature of things in a moral universe. He was later to teach and live and die for the belief that in such a universe love is the greatest of all creative forces. . . Jesus would not fail to see the relevance of the two great prophetic figures of the 'Messiah' and the 'Suffering Servant' for one another and for His own mission . . . The nature of the authority of the Messiah required definition, and the most nearly true definition — the only one adequate in a moral universe — was that to be found in the character of the Suffering Servant . . . Our Lord's mind had no illusion as to how love was to gain its mastery. That must be by the way of suffering, of temptation, of sorrow, of the cross, of death. And because this mind suffered from no complexes, it was prepared to go the way of the cross. It did not care for the world's pomp and glory; nor did it consider mockery and shame beneath its dignity' (pp. 128, 129, 135).

That Jesus spoke of Himself as the Son of Man, Prof. Bowman shews to be beyond all reasonable doubt; but what did the expression mean upon His lips?

> 'It was indeed but the shell which served to enclose the kernel of his deepest convictions. This was to have been expected, for, as we have seen, there is abundant reason to believe that Jesus' thinking was *prophetic,* while the Son of Man concept was *apocalyptic.* In the nature of the case, therefore, it could be no more than a formal use which he would make of this term' (pp. 131-2).

It was, the Professor suggests, the very ambiguity of the phrase which commended it to Jesus —

> 'This term, because of its eschatological reference, could be made to serve for the eventual *exaltation* of the Messiah. At the same time it was sufficiently mundane to allow the attachment to itself of the motif of *humiliation* and *suffering,* which was native to the Servant concept' (pp. 134-5).

And so through the two twofold concept of the Messiah and the Suffering Servant, joined together under the title 'Son of Man' it has happened that:

> 'For the first time in Israel's history a genuinely *redemptive* concept has emerged, and one that is, therefore, in the true sense *prophetic.* For it is this toward which the prophets had been struggling for centuries . . . The elements of the salvation God had to offer his people are all here — power, love, exaltation' (pp. 135-6).

Jesus did not openly or publicly claim to be the Messiah. There was, says Prof. Bowman, 'a subtle method of presenting these claims on Jesus' part' (p. 149). Hence it is entirely wrong to conclude that the so-called Messianic Secret was an invention of the Church to account for the fact that Jesus had no Messianic consciousness at all.

> 'Jesus calls men to *follow* him and then asks them to open their eyes and *see for themselves* what their moral insight has to tell them about himself and his claims . . . He did not openly and brazenly proclaim his Messiahship to all and sundry for the same reason that he would not perform 'signs' in their presence. Had he done either the one or the other, he would have proved himself to be a Messianic pretender of the popular type, and that he had no intention of doing' (p. 149).

The *basis* of our Lord's claim to Messiahship is next discussed and is found to lie in His sense of filial relationship to God, and in His love for mankind.

'He is the Messiah because he is at once God's Son and man's holy Lover. Lacking either character Jesus would have been unworthy of the Lordship which he exercises over men' (p. 158).

Moreover it is a claim revealed through the 'spirit of holiness' manifest in Him.

'This *spirit* our Lord allowed to speak for itself and so to advance his claims to Lordship' (p. 161).

It was therefore in no way dependent upon a virgin birth, or Davidic descent. 'It was,' says Prof. Bowman—

'The Church that added these mundane traditions to its Gospels; but it had the spiritual discernment to refrain from allowing them to obtrude upon the narrative of Jesus' ministry, as though they had influenced any to see in him the Messiah of God' (p. 161).

Finally, Professor Bowman enquires what it was that Jesus, as the suffering Messiah, intended to accomplish. He answers that His object was to create a distinct community, obeying the will of God, owning allegiance to Himself and having as its symbol a fellowship meal. In this last respect he identifies the Last Supper with the *Quiddush* and argues that Jesus had its perpetuation in mind, whether or not He actually said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

'A "fellowship meal" is given exactly for that purpose. Every time it is repeated the old fellowship ties are strengthened, the bonds of love are tied tighter and the comradery is renewed. In coming together for "fellowship" in the breaking of bread and prayers, therefore the primitive community was undoubtedly fulfilling our Lord's desire, if not his express command' (pp. 193-4).

That Jesus did regard His disciples as the nucleus of a Christian Society, and that He did claim from them a real allegiance to Himself may be granted. But in criticizing what he calls the Social Gospel, Prof. Bowman scarcely does justice to the fact that Jesus was undoubtedly willing to accept the love we render to others as though it were rendered to Himself (Matt. xxv, 40), whilst He could not tolerate mere lip-service. (Matt. vii, 21; Mark x, 17). There are at least some circles in which this aspect of our Lord's teaching requires to be insisted on, though generally, no doubt, Prof. Bowman is right in stressing the need for conscious acknowledgement of Jesus as Lord.

This is a book which will appeal to all who appreciate sound commonsense and sober imagination. And to those who have felt the force of the arguments directed against the older liberalism, yet have found the revolt from it not exhilarating but utterly depressing, it will be particularly welcome. The case which it presents against the Form Critics and the Eschatologists is a formidable one. Indeed how anybody after a careful study of it could still believe that Jesus was either a megalomaniac or the product of a 'group-consciousness,' it is hard to imagine. Not that a fresh book was needed to disprove either of these contentions, but there are always those who are ready to be persuaded by something new, though the same arguments in a book written forty years ago, they would regard unhesitatingly as out of date. Old ideas, however true, need constant fresh expression if their freshness is to be retained in the popular mind.

As a matter of fact *The Intention of Jesus* bears more than a little resemblance to Sir John Seeley's *Ecce Homo,* its predecessor by exactly eighty years. At least they are at one in this, that both present us in bold outline with a Christ who is a real convincing figure. During the interval which separates them many attempts have been made to destroy that realism and

conviction. But it is the historic Jesus that has triumphed, and it is the false Christs of mythology and eschatology that are eclipsed.

It may be noticed in passing that Prof. Bowman makes several interesting suggestions of a more or less incidental nature. For example, in our Lord's baptismal experience of the heavenly voice, he sees an indication of His twofold mission — the first part, 'Thou are my beloved Son,' relating to His Messiahship; the second, 'In whom I am well pleased,' (Isaiah xlii, 1) to His rôle as the Suffering Servant (p. 41). Again he asks whether the frequent use of 'charis' (grace) by St. Paul and other New Testament writers was associated in their minds with the personal graciousness of Jesus Himself (p. 88). Certainly it is noteworthy that 'eleos' not 'charis' is the usual Septuagint word for grace.

Each chapter is prefaced by a brief synopsis. This was Dr. Streeter's practice and it might well be adopted generally.

The book is well printed and, save in one respect, well arranged. But the notes, instead of being placed at the foot of each page, are gathered together to form an appendix. No doubt this improves the general appearance of the book, but to keep one's place both in the text and notes is rendered a wearisome and irritating business.

D. L. Scott.

IN PRAISE OF TRADITION *

Some traditions are nothing but obstructive survivals; we know the brand only too well. At the same time tradition can be a source of inspiration, binding one generation to another, hence it is not altogether inappropriate to speak, as Dr. Moffatt does, of 'the thrill' of tradition. And tradition may be useful as against the notion that a view is necessarily true because it is advertised as up-to-date.

Dr. Moffatt supplies some interesting information about the use of the term 'tradition,' which may be traced back to Plato, who did not write lectures, but 'started from the axiom that men require a tutor more than a text-book,' so that his instructions were mainly by means of question and answer. Thus the Greek word *paradosis,* which eventually became an equivalent for 'tradition,' meant at the outset 'oral transmission,' and practically meant 'teaching.' This view of 'tradition' as instruction passed into use by the early Church. The word *paradosis* occurs in 2 *Thess.* ii, 15 and iii, 6. The Apostle warns his readers against the disorderly habit of dropping daily work in view of the immediacy of the Advent; such behaviour he deprecated as out of line with 'the rule (*paradosis*) you received from us.'

In a chapter on 'The New Trent Religion,' which was Bishop Ken's appropriate description of the Counter-Reformation, Dr. Moffatt examines the new apotheosis of Tradition associated with that movement. At the Council of Trent an anathema was pronounced against any who refused 'to receive and revere with an equal (*pari*) affection of piety and reverence' not the written Scriptures only, but 'the unwritten traditions relating alike to faith and morals which were dictated either orally by Christ or by the Holy Spirit, and which have been preserved in unbroken succession within the Catholic Church.' The formula, by thus securing that the Word should not take precedence of Tradition, provided a useful cover for the importation of contraband articles into the practice and belief of the Church—'All things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts,' as the late Alfred Fawkes put it. In the following century Bossuet in his *Meditations on the Gospel,* with laudable logicality, bade the faithful 'never to be surprised at

* *The Thrill of Tradition,* by James Moffatt. (S.C.M. 7/6.)

what the Church of God does. Instructed by the Holy Spirit and by the Tradition of all ages, she knows what Jesus Christ meant.'

Such is the ecclesiastical use of tradition; but if it be regarded as 'funded experience'—to use Santayana's phrase—it takes on a different colour, and the problem each generation has to meet is how to make this capital of funded experience available to meet contemporary costs, mental, moral, and spiritual. To live without traditions would be to repudiate civilization, to be both rootless and fruitless.

Dr. Moffatt's interesting book combines the learning of the scholar with the insight of the man of faith. J. C. H.

Dr. C. C. J. WEBB ON RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE *

In May, 1944, Dr. C. C. J. Webb delivered a public lecture on Religious Experience in the hall of Oriel College, Oxford. He began his lifelong career as an Oxford philosophy teacher, when he was elected Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen in 1889. He was appointed the first Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in 1924. Before he reached the retiring age, and gave up his professorship in 1930, he had delivered the Gifford Lectures; and he continued his work afterwards, giving many notable courses of lectures, both in this country and abroad. This latest lecture, delivered at the age of 80, sums up some of the conclusions of a life's work given to the study of philosophy, and chiefly to the philosophy of the Christian Religion. An appreciation of Dr. Webb and his work, by Professor Grensted is prefixed to the Lecture. I offer now my own tribute of gratitude, for a course of his lectures I attended in 1923, and for his books. Their memory has increased for me the interest and value of this lecture; my hearty agreement with its conclusions is proof how much I owe to him.

When Dr. Webb was elected Tutor of Magdalen in 1889, the dominant school of philosophy in Oxford was British Idealism. Dr. Webb pays a fine tribute to the virtues of the Idealists, to their devotion to truth, to their earnestness in the search for it. He also notes their insistence on the reality and importance of religious experience. But Dr. Webb, who has had a notable influence in leading thinkers away from Idealism to the more empirical and realist outlook to-day, puts his finger on two serious weaknesses. First, some of the Idealists treated religious experience and religion in too subjective a manner. They emphasised the 'I' who is the subject of the experience; they had less to say about God, Who causes it. And second, they did not give enough importance to history; they did not thoroughly appreciate the bond which ties Christianity to certain historical events.

> 'They (the Idealists) are justly chargeable with an insufficient appreciation of the difficulty, not to say the impossibility, of detaching the spiritual essence of the Christian Religion from a certain attitude towards its Founder, from a certain valuation of the historicity of his earthly life, death, and resurrection, which must always resist attempts to sublimate these into symbols of the presence of divinity in all humanity, and even attempts to see in them no more than the first-fruits in a certain individual of that consciousness of such a presence which it is the purpose of religion to arouse in all men' (p. 31).

The Idealists did not attach sufficient importance to history. An empirical and realist philosophy of the Christian Religion starts from the facts of

* *Religious Experience.* A public lecture delivered in Oxford by C. C. J. Webb in May, 1944. (O.U.P. 7/6.)

Christian history. Dr. Webb makes this clear by referring to the traditional antithesis between Natural and Revealed Religion.

> 'A study of the history of the antithesis between Natural and Revealed Religion will show that what is really intended by it is the distinction between the knowledge of God which is imparted by a common experience available to all (for example, that of manifest design in nature) or through processes of reasoning native to the human mind (for example, that by which we infer a necessary ground for any change) and the knowledge of God which is historically mediated. Under this phrase 'historically mediated' I would include the knowledge of God which comes through the channel of an individual's private or personal history (for instance, his perception of divine guidance in the circumstances of his life) as well as what, though now on record, is or was originally, accessible only by means of social contact under conditions of time and place which vary from man to man' (p. 32).

Dr. Webb gives full weight to the uniqueness of the historical events which must always be the basis of any philosophy of the Christian Religion. He continues:

> 'There are, however, certain positions which are often found along with the desire to emphasise the uniqueness and supremacy of the Christian revelation, but which appear to me to be untenable; and with a brief consideraton of these I will bring this lecture to a close.
>
> 1. First among these, in my opinion, untenable positions I would mention that which, not content with denying the irrelevance of historical fact to truth of universal import . . . seeks to withdraw altogether dogmas based on historical fact from the scrutiny and criticism of reason. But as all religious truth is revealed, so is all revelation addressed to the reason. Not only does the content of revelation afford exercise to the reason in tracing its structure and establishing connexions between it and other parts of our experience; it is in the last resort the sole judge of its claim to be regarded as revelation; for there is no other.
>
> 2. There is another position sometimes allied with emphasis on the uniqueness of the Christian revelation which I also could not accept. I mean that which makes what I may call a clean cut between the knowledge of God attainable without or apart from supernatural revelation and that only thereby communicated to us. It will be convenient to illustrate my meaning by the line sometimes drawn between the doctrine of the divine *unity,* which (it has been held) can be established by natural reason, and that of the *trinity* within that unity, which cannot (it is said) be so established, but must be accepted, if at all, solely on the warrant of revelation. Now I do not of course deny that the worship of God by the Christian Church under the threefold Name proclaimed in her baptismal formula cannot be accounted for without reference to certain facts which fall under the head of revelation in the sense in which that word is appropriated to a knowledge of God mediated through historical events. But, be it observed, what is in this sense *revealed* is not the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity; *that* is a philosophical construction, revealed indeed, but revealed through the process of philosophical speculation on the nature of Being, a part of which may be found . . "in the books of the Platonists." What is *revealed,* in the sense of historically mediated, are the *facts* of the life, death and resurrection of a man, of whom his followers found that they could give no other account than that he was the Son of God.

3. The third and last position which I would reject is that which affirms the possibility of distinguishing within the knowledge of God which we possess, however we may have come by it, any portion guaranteed to be unmixed with error. In agreement with the late Professor John Oman . . . I can recognize *infallibility* nowhere, in Pope, or Church, or Bible. Even had the words of our Lord himself been strictly in this sense *infallible*—and few theologians among ourselves to-day would affirm this in respect of matters (such as the date and authorship of Old Testament books, or again, as the facts of pathology) which lay outside the range of knowledge accessible to his human intelligence—we have in any case no indisputable record of his *ipsissima verba,* and so a *guaranteed* infallibility would be still to seek' (p. 41-42).

Dr. Webb ends his lecture with an appeal to a former Oriel man, Bishop Butler. (He was so dissatisfied with the teaching he got at Oriel, that he wanted to transfer to Cambridge.)

'I think that Butler, were he to come among us and to acquaint himself with the learning of to-day, would be confirmed in the choice of the great argument which he took as the theme of his famous book on *The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed to the Constitution and Course of Nature* . . . He would be strengthened in his old conviction that even to the end "probability is to us the very guide of life . . . "'

J. K. Nettlefold.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN *

The fact that Trinity College, Dublin (or Dublin University) has been the subject of three 'histories' in little more than fifty years shows that the authors (of two of them, at least) were not deceived in thinking that the College and its activities were a subject of general interest. In 1889 Dr. J. W. Stubbs, a Senior Fellow, brought its story to the end of the eighteenth century; in 1902 the late Professor W. MacNeile Dixon contributed *Trinity College, Dublin* to a series of College Histories; and the Lecky Professor of Modern History, Dr. Constantia Maxwell, has just published through the Dublin University Press a volume of nearly 300 pages, in which the story of Trinity is told from the College's foundation to its tercentenary celebrations. Of the three 'histories,' this last should have the greatest expectation of life.

One might ask (perhaps hypercritically) whether institutions such as colleges can have in a strict sense *histories*. The word seems applicable rather to growing organisms; there was a history of Tom Jones and there have been histories of England. The word *annals* seems more descriptive of such books as Professor Maxwell's; but *annals* suggest dullness, and this book is not dull. The author was no doubt aware of the difficulty of avoiding dullness, and therefore made her book to a large extent a record of interesting personalities; and of interesting personalities Trinity has had its share. 'What other college, I had almost said, what other university, could show a nobler roll?' asks the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, in a foreword to the book, and T.C.D. graduates the world over will answer 'None.'

The roll has contained notable names from the College's earliest years. Among the first graduates was the very learned James Ussher, who became Archbishop of Armagh, and who is popularly remembered as the man who dated the proceedings recorded at the beginning of the first chapter of

* *A History of Trinity College, Dublin,* by Constantia Maxwell. (Dublin University Press. 15/-.)

Genesis. Dr. Maxwell has included a portrait of Ussher which makes it easy for us to believe, not only in the intelligence but also in the goodness which his contemporaries (Oliver Cromwell included) found in him. Ussher's library was saved from dispersal through the intervention of the Protector and the generosity of the Parliamentary army in Ireland, and at the Restoration it was housed in Trinity College. Ussher belonged to an old Anglo-Irish family, but most of the notable men connected with the College in the first half of the seventeenth century were English by birth. William Bedell, an Essex man, was Provost from 1627 to 1629, a short period of office but, as Dr. Maxwell shows, an important one. He seems to have brought much-needed order into College affairs, and is noted for his efforts to cater for the needs of Irish-speaking students. He learnt Irish, and had the Old Testament translated into that language. As Bishop of Kilmore he was exposed to the savagery of 1641, but was unhurt by the rebels, who on his death in that year gave his body burial worthy of his rank. William Chappell, Milton's Cambridge tutor, was made Provost in 1634, and Lucius Cary, the Lord Falkland of the Civil War years, was among the graduates of the second decade of the century. During the Commonwealth period, the brothers Samuel and Increase Mather, graduates of Harvard, came to Dublin, where the elder became a Fellow of the College and the younger was offered Fellowship.

The college buildings of those days have all disappeared. Trinity College as we know it to-day began to take shape during the early years of the eighteenth century. Its buildings expressed the change that had taken place in the relations of the Anglo-Irish to the rest of the population. Trinity was no longer the college of a threatened minority, and its feeling of security showed itself in the size and solidity of the new buildings. Trinity was the preserve of the English in Ireland. It is true, as Dr. Maxwell points out, that even before the Relief Act of 1793 Roman Catholics were free to enter the College, but they were prevented from graduating by oaths which they could not conscientiously take.

Not all Trinity men of the eighteenth century approved of discrimination favouring members of the Established Church. Provost Hely-Hutchinson (1774-1794), a man whom the self-regarding instincts seemed likely to make indifferent to the injustice suffered by the majority, advocated Catholic emancipation and was willing to see Catholics enjoying the educational advantages open to Protestants (p. 128). He lived to see Catholic students admitted to degrees by the legislation in England. It was not, however, till 1873 that students of all creeds were entitled to compete for all the good things that Trinity offered. Thirty-one years later, women were admitted to the University, all examinations being open to them, that for Fellowship alone excepted.

The second half of the century—the great Victorian, or rather Darwinian, period—was one of Trinity's flowering times. It is with this period that Dr. Maxwell has brought her record to a close. In 1892 the College celebrated its three-hundredth birthday. Representatives of 75 academies came to Dublin, and the distinguished company was met by one of the most distinguished of the College's Provosts, George Salmon, then in his 73rd year. Those who remember those days wonder whether Trinity could ever before have brought more illustrious alumni to meet her guests. It was the period in which Darwinism was stimulating, directly or indirectly, all thinking minds and giving them a new orientation. It was also the beginning of a period in which investigators, Trinity men among them, were preparing ground for conclusions respecting the constitution of the Universe which would have excited inextinguishable laughter among the satisfied materialists

of earlier generations. Trinity College in the period of this new *Weltanschauung,* is the subject of a volume by Dr. K. C. Bailey, Fellow of the College, which is expected from the University Press before long. If it turns out to be as good a book as Professor Maxwell's, graduates of Dublin (and, I hope, others) will have reason to be grateful to both writers, and to the University Press if the second volume is produced in a form as attractive as the first.

H. R. Chillingworth.

SERMONS BY THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S *

A book by the Dean of St. Paul's is always interesting. The present volume has the particular interest of recalling the thoughts, anxieties and hopes of the war years. It consists of sermons preached by Dr. Matthews during the years 1941-1945. In a short preface he describes some of the convictions which the great events we have passed through have confirmed in his mind.

> 'No one who thinks at all could have passed through the past six years without being profoundly affected in mind and spirit. I have come to believe more definitely than before that the Christian faith and the Person of Christ have the answer to the problems of humanity. I have come to discern truth in doctrines which formerly were only superficially apprehended. In particular the doctrines of sin and judgment and of the Church have taken on a new significance in the fire of war. It has become evident to me that the most profound question we can ask is, What is man? And that we have to settle this before we can make any sure advance towards a better civilization. In the debate between Christianity and secular Humanism I am convinced that Christianity is essentially right. But at the same time I have become more certain than ever that the whole Christian faith has to be thought out again in the light of the new knowledge and has to be stated in terms more intelligible to the man of to-day' (p. v).

Dean Matthews then states his own theological position. He recalls that the late Bishop of London once called him an 'Orthodox Modernist.'

> 'If by Modernism is meant the readiness to welcome new knowledge and to think about the problems which occupy the minds of the present age, then I am a Modernist, and indeed I could not by any effort transform myself into anything else. But I do not believe that freedom of thought requires me to abandon all the teaching of the Church and try to build up a system of doctrine for myself. It seems to me that the doctrines of the Church are the expression of an experience of Reality which come to me with an authority not to be ignored . . . I would assert, there is no absurdity in holding that the ancient faith may be interpreted in new ways and that a reverence for the continuing life and experience of the Church is not incompatible with a sincere devotion to truth' (p. vi).

The keynote of the volume is struck by a very fine sermon preached in St. Paul's on Advent Sunday, 1942 from 1 *Peter* ii. 11, 12. 'I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims . . .' There are other notable sermons on 'Judgment Day,' 'This miserable Church' and 'Education as Awakening.' Perhaps in a few of the sermons the analysis of the subject might have been

* *Strangers and Pilgrims,* by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews. (Nisbet. 1945. 8/6.)

carried further; for instance in that on 'Casting Out Unclean Spirits.' Dr. Matthews stayed at his post in the deanery throughout the blitzes; for less determined people sermon composition would have been impossible in such conditions. As it is, Dr. Matthews speaks to us from the heart of the City of London, during the most momentous six years of our national history. His sermons are historical documents. They also contain the wise reflexions of a fine Christian mind on the needs of the present and the hopes for the future.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

'A PROPHET FOR THESE TIMES'

This volume of sermons by Professor Niebuhr recalls the notable series of Gifford Lectures he delivered in 1939 under the title, 'The Nature and Destiny of Man.' The style of the lectures is very difficult, particularly in the first part. And some of the judgments Professor Niebuhr passed on Great Britain and her Allies were annoyingly detached, severe and even unfair. The United States were not then at war with Germany, and we were.

In both these matters English readers will prefer the present volume of sermons. Their style is easier, for they are sermons; although they were not written down until after they had been delivered. Secondly, since the Gifford Lectures, the United States have been engaged with us in a life and death struggle with our common enemies. We now face together the equally difficult problems of establishing lasting peace. Professor Niebuhr no longer writes as a neutral and supposedly disinterested onlooker. He recognizes that he has equal responsibility with ourselves in finding solutions to the questions before us.

These sermons are his attempt to show the way which Christians should follow,

> 'to interpret certain aspects of the Christian faith in terms of their special relevance to the thought and the life of our age. Being a tragic age which has suffered two great world conflicts and which cannot yet be certain that it has the moral resources or the political instruments to avoid further world chaos, the primary theme . . . is the relation of the historical to the trans-historical elements of the Christian faith. The Christian community prays, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," and thereby testifies that it believes in the realization of God's will in human history. But it also confesses with St. Paul, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," thereby expressing its understanding of the fact that the Christian hope transcends the limits of history as we know it. The sermons are meant to elaborate these two facets of the Christian hope, in the belief that an age confronted with so many possibilities of realizing God's will in new dimensions of historic existence, but also confronting so many historic frustrations, is in particular need of the Christian gospel; and requires both the relative-historical, and the final and absolute facets of the Christian hope to maintain its sanity and its sense of the meaning of existence' (p. 7).

One great merit of these sermons is that Professor Niebuhr keeps so clearly in view both 'the relative-historical and the final and absolute facets of the Christian hope.' We are human beings with our lives to live, and life

* *Discerning the Signs of the Times.* Sermons for To-day and To-morrow. By Reinhold Niebuhr. (S.C.M. Press. 1946. 8/6.)

means action. We have responsibilities and must do something. In the late war we had to defend civilization and religion against the German and Japanese barbarians. We must try to destroy evil and establish good. But there is often some good in the evil which is destroyed, and there is always evil in the good that is established. And we are to blame for some of the evil which we oppose; while all our judgments are coloured by preference for ourselves and our own interests, since we are actors in the drama, and can only judge from our own position in the scene. The victor nations are tempted to think too well of themselves and too badly of their enemies.

> 'Thus the so-called democratic nations were good enough to preserve a measure of justice against tyranny in recent conflicts. But the idea which they have written into the Charter of the United Nations, that there are "peace-loving" nations who can be absolutely distinguished from the peace-breaking ones, obviously does not bear close inspection. The peace of the coming centuries will be less than a perfect or stable peace because Russia, Britain and America will compound their concern for justice with a concern for their own prestige and power' (p. 123).

In the late war the United Nations were an instrument in God's hand for the overthrow of tyranny and evil. But victory now confronts them with a new problem, the conversion of Germany and Japan from evil to good.

> 'We can, as instruments of the divine justice, set a limit to the defiance of tyranny against the justice of our civilized institutions. The nations which engaged in such defiance have been brought low and their cities lie in dust and ashes. The imagination of faith is right in discerning this doom as part of the divine justice, however much human instruments of this justice may have obscured and brought confusion into the terrible drama. But this punishment does not reach the heart of Germany or Japan. No punishment can. Justice and wrath . . . prove to men and nations that there are limits beyond which their rebellion cannot go. But punishment may prompt men and nations to despair as well as to repentance. There can indeed be no repentance if love does not shine through the justice' (p. 127).

The United Nations will be tempted to commit many errors in their treatment of Germany and Japan. One of them will be to assume an attitude of self-righteousness, that they are entirely innocent, and Germany and Japan guilty. In a very notable sermon on the Peace of God, Professor Niebuhr sketches the right attitude for nations and individuals. It is a commentary on St. Paul's words. 'With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. But He that judgeth me is the Lord' (1 Cor. iv. 3, 4). We should have a lively sense of our own shortcomings, remembering too that God sees in us many faults of which we are unconscious. Nevertheless, consciousness of our own faults should not paralyze us. We have to act, to do the right as we see it. And if we are honestly trying to serve God and do our best, then we can have peace of mind, the peace of God. For the peace of God is

> 'a peace in which an uneasy conscience is curiously compounded with an easy conscience. This peace rests upon the faith that God is great enough and good enough to resolve the contradiction in which human life stands; and that His mercy is the final resource of His power, by which He overcomes the rebellion of man against his creator' (p. 165).

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

ANNUAL MEETING AND ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL

SIR,

The date of the Annual General Meeting of the Modern Churchmen's Union has yet to be fixed by the Council, but I would like to remind members that the meeting takes place not earlier in the year than May 10th, and that nominations for election to the Council must reach me not later than four weeks before the date of the Annual Meeting.

The following members of the Council are due to retire this spring and are not eligible for re-election, but may be co-opted when the Council meets after the Annual Meeting: Rev. H. Bailey, Canon J. S. Bezzant, M. S. Gotch, Esq., Rev. W. G. Fallows, Rev. R. H. Preston, Canon I. T. Ramsey, Rev. W. Richardson, Rev. C. E. Seamer, Rev. H. J. Trueman, Miss M. Irene Walker. There are ten seats to be filled by election for a period of three years and the Council has power to co-opt nine members to serve from the time of the first meeting after the Annual Meeting until the next Annual Meeting. The other business of the Annual Meeting is to receive the report of the Council and to elect the President and the Hon. Treasurer. Any member who wishes to bring forward a resolution must give me notice at least a fortnight before the meeting.

R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH,
Hon. Secretary, M.C.U.

Steeple Claydon Vicarage,
Bletchley, Bucks.
January, 1947.

CHURCH PARADES: SOME FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

SIR,

The case against compulsory church parades seems at first sight very strong. Even the suspicion of compulsion, where religion is concerned, is repugnant to the English conscience. It is claimed that the Church Service would benefit and would have a more wholesome effect if it was confined to those who had a sincere urge to attend it.

Everyone knows, of course, that there is no real compulsion seeing that the soldier can declare on his form that he is not a Churchman, and can in fact put himself down as an Atheist.

Let us see how the matter stands. Here is what one ex-Service man writes: 'I rather enjoy church parades. That is a purely personal view and the people who disagree with the practice have many arguments in their favour. The usual custom of officers is to arrange the assembly at least two hours before the actual service is due to begin. It would appear to be a longer period in winter, though whether from any ulterior motive on the part of the commissioned ranks or not is a moot point. One stands in the freezing cold, utterly dejected and most annoyed. The sergeant-major bullies one into place and there one waits until the officers condescend to appear. After a lot of play on the part of the sergeants—"Attention," "Stand at ease," "Form threes"—one is at last brought to attention frankly bewildered with it all. In church some listen to the service in a tolerant mood, others feel they are

doing their duty to God by going. To some, however, comes the feeling of contentment, the hearing of lovely well-remembered words of hymns learnt long ago, the deep happiness and serenity that only familiar impressions and beautiful old buildings can bring.'

Then others tell us that non-attendance involves unpleasant penalties, fatigue duties and so on. It would seem then that the sergeant-major has taken advantage of the church service to impose his ideas on the proceeding, and so the aim and object of such a parade is swallowed up and lost in what should be called not a Church Parade, but the Sergeant-Major's Day Out. It degrades the Church Service if it is equated with some unpleasant task.

But what were the Army Chaplains doing to let this happen? It must be remembered that the agitation to abolish the compulsory parade comes at a time when the average age of the soldiers is much higher than it will be in peace time. The men had been in civilian life and accustomed to consult their own interests and feelings, and while they were ready to sacrifice pesonal comfort and even all that life held dear, they wished, where they could, to enjoy that liberty of not going to church, for that did not imperil the great cause; so, at least, some of them thought. The situation in peace time, however, will be entirely different. Young men of eighteen, many of them just out of school, are to be conscripted from every class of home in the country. They are going from the careful supervision of family and friends, probably abroad to Germany, Austria, Palestine or the Far East. The Army, then, *in loco parentis,* incurs a heavy moral responsibility towards these youths. They will, unlike those who took part in the war, not be absorbed in the supreme task of preserving the nation, but merely in policing the conquered territories or in the drab routine of garrisoning a distant colony. They will have a great deal of leisure, and be surrounded by those whose standards are different from their own. The conquered people in Germany and elsewhere are demoralized, and will do anything to secure food or money or some privilege which even the young soldier will be in a position to give. It is not necessary to enlarge upon the moral dangers to which these youths will be exposed in their leisure time in these conditions. They are well known. The moral costs to them will be very high, for they have hardly had time to secure that firmness of will and that stability of character which would be necessary to overcome these obvious temptations.

Would the parents of such youths, if they were asked, not approve of compulsory church parades, if sensibly arranged; and would the majority of these young men not welcome them, seeing that it would take from them the responsibility of a decision which they, in their immaturity of mind, are not strong enough to make for themselves in the presence of that minority who are always ready to jeer at the church-goer? After all, they have been accustomed in school to compulsory attendance at religious worship; it cannot be a serious hardship to continue along these lines in the army. It will be a serious matter if some of these healthy-minded young men who have been compelled to join the army are returned to their homes soiled in character and unfitted for the ordinary life of the community. It would certainly reflect on the Church, for religion and morals in this country have always been related.

We are told that there will be compulsory church parades on special occasions such as national festivals. In other words, the army is going to be used to give colour and dignity to the pageantry in these events, whose importance is to be emphasized by a church service. In this the soldiers play a secondary part. The service is not theirs nor will the main theme of the service have any relation to them.

The soldier as a private citizen can go as often as he likes to church, but there is surely strong grounds for associating the army officially with the Christian religion. The soldier is in a special category, seeing that he is the agent by which we seek to establish those principles of justice, truth, honour, the significance of man and in short all the Christian virtues. If the country is established on these Christian ideals, as we claim, then it is obvious that the soldier as such should be made acquainted with them. They are an essential part of his education, and only in so far as he is imbued with them will he be able to vindicate them by his arms.

The prestige of the British soldier is as high as it is because he inherits the traditions of Chivalry. The knight spent the vigil in prayer, laid his sword upon the altar, and dedicated it to the service of God, his king and his country. Shakespeare pitches the claim very high when he says :

> 'This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings
> Renowned for their birth, as far from home
> For Christian service and true chivalry
> As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
> Of the world's ransom, Blessed Mary's son.'

It has been said that the finest army that England produced was Cromwell's, which consisted entirely of God-fearing men who proved again and again that victory lies with those who are convinced of the righteousness of their cause. The profession of arms in England has little or no meaning if it is divorced from the Christian principles which it was created to establish.

This education of the soldier in Christian principles lies within the province of the chaplain who, at present, according to many ex-soldiers, spends too much of his time in attacking their morals when they are assembled in church. This is surely a negative approach, and moreover it is based on an assumption which is not true since many of those present are quite innocent of the sin he denounces. Many of course speak of the excellent work some of the chaplains have done, but there are too many who feel that they have been treated like children, talked down to, and not addressed as intelligent, ordinary members of the community. The approach can and should be on a higher plane, they think.

Finally, is it not time that we got rid of the word 'padre,' which has nothing English about it and is ridiculous both in sound and connotation to ordinary ears. The official word 'Chaplain' ought to be encouraged on all occasions.

LANCELOT FORSTER.

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1947

The Modern Churchmen's Conference for 1947 will be held at Westfield College, Hampstead, London. Its date will be Monday, September 22nd, to Saturday the 27th. The Hon. Sec. of the Conference is Miss Irene Walker, F.R.Hist.Soc., Churchill Court, nr. Bristol.

H. D. A. MAJOR.